

Public Comments on the Bay Area to Central Valley HST Final Program EIR/EIS Received Via the California High-Speed Rail Authority's Website

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W001-1	Ms. Eileen Wasser / Simi Valley, CA	Wonderful. I wish Ventura County could be included in this plan, or is there a way for high-speed connection to include Simi Valley/Thousand Oaks, Oxnard, Ventura and Santa Barbara.	Comment acknowledged. Please refer to the California High-Speed Rail Authority's (Authority's) and the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA's) certified statewide program environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (November 2005). The proposed high-speed train (HST) system would not directly serve the areas listed but would be connected via conventional intercity and Metrolink services at multi-modal stations like Los Angeles Union Station. Extensions of the HST system could be a possibility in the future.
W002-1	Mr. Kpish Goyal / Attorney / Atherton, CA	<p>I believe the best route to choose is the Altamont Pass. The Pacheco Pass route goes through areas that are sparsely populated, whereas the Altamont route traverses an area east of the Bay Area that is much more populated, and that has a rapidly increasing population. Furthermore, the Altamont route makes the future connection to Sacramento much shorter, less costly, and thus more feasible in the future. The Altamont also decreases the time from Sacramento to San Francisco and San Jose, which will be a heavily traversed corridor in Northern California. The Pacheco route just isn't appropriate given our population trends, and our existing areas of population.</p> <p>I thus strongly urge the California High Speed Rail Authority to choose the Altamont route.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W003-1	Mrs. Paula Overholtzer / Merced Mariposa Asthma Coalition / Respiratory Therapist / CA	This is one of the most important projects for air quality for the future. No other project should take the money needed for this.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W004-1	Mr. Charles Shaheen / Fresno, CA	Do not pass high speed train through the natural habitat wetlands area, this will disrupt the migratory bird populations of the area!	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letter L029.



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W005-1	Mr. Alex Kiriaze / Castro Valley, CA	OPPOSE the route in Merced County along Henry Miller Road or anywhere near or through the wetlands.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.
W006-1	Mr. Bill Meyer / Private land owner in the vicinity / Engineer / San Jose, CA	You have GOT to be kidding! Positively NO NO NO! Cannot encroach ANY further with development into the wetlands area!!! Too much encroachment has happened already and I am disgusted with continual damage to one of our last areas for migrating birds to use by continued development into this area. Already I am completely amazed and disgusted with allowing home building on highway 33 near San Luis forebay right across the street from a refuge! I can't believe this one either!!! Absolutely..... STOP encroachment into our last area of wetlands!!!!!!	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.
W007-1	Ms. Thomas Balgooyen / Morgan Hill, CA	As a professor for 33 years of field biology in the Department of the Biological Sciences at San Jose State University, I do not recommend the proposed HST along the route of Henry Miller Road. The wetlands of the area cannot withstand the kind of disturbance in construction or operation of an HST. Without question, the fastest shrinking ecosystem in the World is the wetland. We need to do everything possible to preserve these delicate, unique systems. In addition, the Federal Government has spent millions of our dollars to preserve and purchase the right to sustain the wetlands held by private duck clubs. We need to find alternate routes to reduce the impact on the valley's wetlands. Respectfully, Thomas G Balgooyen, Professor	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.
W008-1	Mr. Stephen Wilson / H.S. Biology Teacher / Los Banos, CA	This message is in concern for the placement of the High Speed Train being located next to Henry Miller Road north of Los Banos. This route is alongside two major wildlife refuge sanctuaries. Its location is more harassment and pressure to our declining migratory waterfowl. The wetlands continues to shrink in acreage and our Los Banos community is under threat from a migrating Bay Area population. Please reconsider your plans.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.
W009-1	Mr David McCabe / Watsonville, CA	HST is a great idea, but the ROW location in Merced, County near Los Banos is unacceptably close to the single largest remaining wetland in the State.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
			O011.
W010-1	Mr. Joseph Thompson / Attorney / Gilroy, CA	<p>Dear Mr. Chairman & Directors,</p> <p>Identity: I have been doing post-doctoral study of transportation law & policy for the past 29 years, including at the Mineta Institute, TRB Georgetown, and LOC. I am a member of the TLA (past chair, Legislation Committee) and spent 1964-70 working for SP's PMT at San Jose intermodal facility, and 1970-80 working for UPRR's Traffic Dept., San Jose, serving Central California Coast Region shippers & receivers.</p>	Comment acknowledged.
W010-2	Mr. Joseph Thompson / Attorney / Gilroy, CA	<p>Summary: I say now what I said to HSRC at five different cities. If you were the board of directors of a privately held company you'd be terminated for incompetence. If you put enough Fedex, UPS and USPS tonnage on the HSR, then you wouldn't have to ask the taxpayers for a dime.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA disagree with the comment. This comment raises an issue that was addressed and repeats prior comments that were responded to as part of the FRA's and Authority's certified statewide program EIR/EIS (November 2005). The response to this comment in the statewide program EIR/EIS (Response to Comments of Joseph P. Thompson, March 10, 2004 [Letter I015]) is provided below.</p> <p>If the HST project is to move forward in California, the Authority believes that the private sector will contribute to its financing. The Authority supports private-sector participation in the implementation and operations of HST in California to the greatest degree possible. In its June 2000 Business Plan, the Authority states, "the public's investment should be limited to that which is necessary to ensure the construction of the basic system" and "private-sector funding to construct major elements of the system would be both practicable and advisable" (Introduction Letter to Governor and Legislature). The Authority's considerable research into global experience in the development of high-speed ground transportation does not support the notion that the proposed HST could be completely privately financed and it would be unrealistic</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
			<p>to promote such an approach in California.</p> <p>Feasibility studies by both the Commission (1993-1996) and the Authority (1997-2000) showed that while HST in California could operate at a revenue surplus, most of the capital costs of the initial system would have to be publicly financed. Both the Commission and the Authority investigated the potential for freight services that would be compatible with the HST passenger services. These investigations concluded that while freight services on the HST tracks could operate at a surplus, the revenue contribution from such freight would be small in comparison to passenger services. The Authority's June 2000 Business Plan assumed an operating income from freight of about \$10 million by 2020, and more than \$16 million by 2030 (Financial Plan, PFM, November 2, 1999).</p> <p>Although the Program EIR/EIS is focused on intercity passenger travel, the Authority has envisioned the HST Alternative as having the potential to carry express freight. Section 2.6.3 of the Draft Program EIR/EIS, Potential for Freight Services, states that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">the proposed HST system could be used to carry small packages, parcels, letters, or any other freight that would not exceed typical passenger loads. This service could be provided in either specialized freight cars on passenger trains or on dedicated lightweight freight trains. In either case, the lightweight freight vehicles would be required to have the same performance characteristics as the passenger equipment. This type of freight could be accommodated without adjustment to the passenger operational plan or modification to the passenger stations</p>



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
			<p>and therefore was included in the funding scenario described in the Business Plan.</p> <p>Section 2.6.3 of the Draft Program EIR/EIS also recognizes that a high-speed freight service might also be provided on specialized, medium-weight freight trains.</p> <p>It would not be practicable for the private sector to completely finance and implement HST in California and in the United States. Every effort to date to build an HST system solely reliant on private sector financing in the United States has failed because the rate of return on investment for the private sector simply has not been enough to outweigh the billions of dollars needed to create and to implement a system. Currently, the United States has extensive highway and air transportation networks which offer relatively low-cost intercity transportation anywhere in the nation.</p>
W010-3	Mr. Joseph Thompson / Attorney / Gilroy, CA	<p>History: I recommend that you read Lenin biography, Gulag Archipelago, When Railroads Were New (1901), and Lincoln's words to Brig. Gen. Granville Dodge in 1864 when Dodge told Lincoln that the transcontinental railroad should be owned by the government, and Lincoln said no, but the government would assist private enterprise in building it. Also, the fate of Wm. Jennings Bryan's "plumb plan" to nationalize industry including the railroads, and the fate of USA railroads that the government nationalized during WWI. History proves that government ownership of RR don't work. Read Margaret Thatcher's autobiography.</p> <p>Conclusion: We wasted billions on Amtrak subsidies, but lacked effective airport security on 9/11/01. We waste billions moving empty transit seats, bus & rail, while our highways are unsafe and our bridges are falling down. We have shiny new Light Rail fiascoes, sucking taxpayers dry to reward public sector unions, while motorists are paying 99% of fully amortized costs of public transit. That pig won't fly; that dog won't bark. Why did USA miss the "privatization revolution" and follow APTA to Hell? Is that what our grandchildren will say about our generation? After defeating the USSR, why did we adopt its failed economic policy? Nationalized passenger service by any mode is a prescription for failure, just as nationalized health care is. We have</p>	Please see Response to Comment W010-2.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>the best RRs in the world today, bottomed on capitalism.</p> <p>Recommendation: Follow the Invisible Hand of Adam Smith; reject the Iron Fist of Karl Marx. Rail yes; Soviet-style horizontal elevators no. I don't want my grandchildren to hate my memory. Asa Whitney was wrong. This is America, not USSR-USA.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Joseph P. Thompson</p> <p>PS. My ancestors from England were from the Darlington-Stockton area, so I guess that I have RRs in my blood.</p> <p>Joe Thompson (408) 848-5506 Email: TransLaw@PacBell.Net</p>	
W010-4	Mr. Joseph Thompson / Attorney / Gilroy, CA	PPS. Please include my previous public comment about your last EIR as a comment to this one. Same logic applies to both. Thanks.	Please see Response to Comment W010-2.
W011-1	Mr. Scott Kruse / Sierra Nevada Alliance / Biophysical Geographer / Fresno, CA	This is rational and objective. Continued support of individual vehicles makes no sense in light of Peak Oil, climate change and human population pressures. I very much look forward to robust, integrated, convenient rail transportation for California. Each community must build their non-sprawl infrastructure to integrate with high speed rail. This clearly follows the well established global economic geography models of Von Thunen and Christaller. Time to put highways on a starvation diet and build efficient, climate-appropriate, long-term transportation that serves people, not vehicles.	Comment acknowledged.
W012-1	Mr. Tim Pitsker /Lawyer / Fremont, CA	Residents of Fremont and Sunol adamantly oppose the Altamont Pass Alternative. This alternative includes nearly 3 1/2 miles of tunnels through Niles Canyon and the elimination of the Niles Historical Train. Niles Canyon is a scenic beauty and both Fremont and Sunol will fight hard to preserve it and the Historical Train. The State of California has designated Niles Canyon road a scenic road. Any tampering with Niles Canyon and you will have a huge environmental fight on your hands. Please eliminate the Altamont Pass Alternative.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W012-2	Mr. Tim Pitsker / Lawyer / Fremont, CA	On the other hand, both San Jose and Monterey County support the Pacheco Pass Alternative. Why not build the HSR where it is wanted instead of getting into a battle where it is not wanted? You should also include in the Pacheco Pass Alternative a freight line and have a combined freight and passenger corridor. Currently MTC is	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		planning on putting short haul freight through Niles Canyon, but that will be contested by Fremont and Sunol. However, Monterey County wants the freight to be shipped through its county so its agriculture business will have easy access to the Central Valley. So you should work with MTC to build a combined passenger and freight corridor through Pacheco Pass.	Preferred Alternative. The planning and inclusion of a short haul freight line is not the responsibility of the Authority and beyond the scope of this Program EIR/EIS.
W012-3	Mr. Tim Pitsker / Lawyer / Fremont, CA	The 2005 EIR/EIS eliminated the Altamont Pass Alternative. I incorporate by reference Chapter 2 on Alternatives, pages 2-35 to 2-38, Section F. ALTAMONT PASS (CENTRAL VALLEY TO BAY AREA) of the 2005 EIR/EIS. This section gives an excellently reasoned explanations as to why the Altamont Pass Alternative should be eliminated. Most of the points made are still applicable to the current EIR/EIS.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W013-1	Mr. Daniel Sonke / Agriculture Scientist / Escalon, CA	I favor a high speed rail route to the Bay Area through the Altamont route rather than the more southern route along 152. So much of the Central Valley's rapid urbanization has been in the Modesto area. A rail route would alleviate the developing traffic problems while facilitating concentration of development around the rail corridor. My goal is to reduce and concentrate urbanization. I also fear that the southern route would increase development in the Merced area while doing nothing to alleviate the problems developing in the Modesto area.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also refer to Chapter 5, "Economic Growth and Impacts," of this Final Program EIR/EIS and Standard Response 4 regarding growth.
W013-2	Mr. Daniel Sonke / Agriculture Scientist / Escalon, CA	For the same reasons, I favor routes through the Central Valley which allow for downtown stations (e.g. in Modesto or Tracy) rather than the routes on the outskirts of cities. I fear these routes, though more rural and perhaps therefore easier to implement, would actually encourage further sprawl and abandonment of downtown business and residential areas. Downtown stations would encourage redevelopment of city cores. They also would attract business travelers like me. I try to travel by rail in the Valley whenever possible, but stations located outside the city core make it problematic to get to a meeting downtown.	Comment acknowledged. The Preferred Alternative includes stations at downtown Modesto and downtown Merced. Please see Chapter 8 of this Final Program EIR/EIS.
W014-1	Mr. Richard Schussel / Pleasanton, CA	I am very concerned about the proposal and it's affect on waterfowl, and other shore birds. The Grasslands are a cherished jewel to this state and country and needs to remain a haven for birds and animals.... Many duck clubs could be affected and that would ultimately mean potential loss of hunters AND THEIR MONEY - which funds the watering and agricultural practices for those clubs. I would rather not see the railway built anywhere near the Grasslands and it's sanctuaries.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W015-1	Mr. Craig Easton / Stevinson, CA	I am totally against the high speed train on Henry miller road there are other places to put it without in are grasslands I hope you see both side on this issue.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.
W016-1	Mr. Lane Davis / Engineer / Salinas, CA	The 'Pacheco Pass Route' should be the preferred bay area route so as to include Monterey County and Santa Clara County in the transportation benefits of the California High-Speed Rail Project.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W016-2	Mr. Lane Davis / Engineer / Salinas, CA	<p>A stop in Gilroy would be very beneficial to the citizens on the central coast and provide a hub for tourist transport to the Monterey/Santa Cruz tourist destinations. Also, a stop en route to San Francisco in San Jose (aka 'Silicon Valley') would be valuable as the technological engine to the world lies here.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lane Davis Salinas, CA</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W017-1	Mr. Anthony Dominguez / Santa Clara County / Law Enforcement / Gilroy, CA	Please do the right thing and route high-speed rail through the Pacheco Pass into the Bay Area. San Jose and Silicon Valley should be a focal point of the HSR system, not a spur destination. For Central Valley commuters east of Tracy, make improvements instead to ACE rail. Thank you.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W018-1	Mr. Jose Govea / Fremont, CA	<p>In reviewing the Draft EIR/EIS, I would like to strongly recommend that the Pacheco Pass Alternative be the one selected for the High Speed Train from the Central Valley to the S.F. Bay Area. In terms of revenue, more direct connection to San Jose (and then San Francisco) would yield the largest potential considering rider ship need and quantity. I believe it would also minimize environmental impact to such areas as Niles, if the Altamont pass were to be used.</p> <p>Regards, José Govea</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W019-1	Ms. Joanne Bertoli / Fremont, CA	We want the Pacheco Pass Alternative not the Altamont Pass Alternative because of the environmental consequences to Niles Canyon and the loss of the Historic Train.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
			Preferred Alternative.
W020-1	Ms. Jennifer Emmett / Fremont, CA	<p>I am against the High Speed Train in its entirety. I feel it is a waste of my tax dollars and merely a pet-project of special interest groups.</p> <p>However, if the project must go through, the train should go through the Pacheco Pass, NOT the Altamont. The environmental impact of a high speed train traveling through the Niles Canyon and across or through the Don Edwards Wildlife Refuge is too great.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W021-1	Ms. Sarah Jeske / Fremont, CA	<p>Dear Sirs:</p> <p>I would like to see the Pacheco Pass Alternative NOT the Altamont Pass Alternative because of the environmental consequences to Niles Canyon and the loss of the Historic Train. The Historic Train ride through Niles Canyon is a city treasure and should not become a consequence of bad planning.</p> <p>Thank you, Sarah Jeske</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W022-1	Mr. Art Lewellan / Portland, OR	<p>A non-electrified TALGO high-speed train at 150mph is faster than the proposed 220mph Bombardier-type trainset. Don't believe it? Electrification is at least 1/4 of the project cost. Speed is determined by track upgrading, continuous rail, and grade separation first, then electrification which will NOT actually produce an average 220mph. Average speed, even with electrification, is closer to 150mph. With TALGO-type trainsets, track upgrades are less extensive, less expensive and mostly necessary between San Jose and Los Angeles. The link between San Jose and San Francisco is ready to go now. Most of the route is rural where little environmental benefit will occur with electrification.</p>	Please see the Authority's and FRA's certified statewide program EIR/EIS (November 2005).
W022-2	Mr. Art Lewellan / Portland, OR	<p>The Bay Area's rail network needs to be integrated, meaning transferring between Caltrans, Amtrak, BART, light rail, bus systems, and the new high-speed train line is a far more important engineering consideration than providing 1-seat rides for the luxury of high-speed train riders. Land-use and development patterns that generate transit ridership benefit at such critical transfer points. All Bay Area transit systems should follow these theories of transit integration overlaid with transit-oriented principles of land-use and development. The hub which the new high-speed train must directly serve, following these guidelines, is San Jose.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative includes the Downtown San Jose station. All HST stations will be multi-modal transportation hubs. Please see Chapter 6, "Station Area Development," of this Final Program EIR/EIS.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W022-3	Mr. Art Lewellan / Portland, OR	<p>Still don't believe 150mph TALGO-type trainsets are faster than a 220mph Bombardier-type trainsets like the Amtrak Acela? Keep pushing for that faster and far more expensive electric train and California will get NO high-speed rail system. 150mph is faster than failure. Go TALGO first! Expensive electrification can follow as the system matures. (Please don't casually reply with the lame bureaucratic 'excuse' that THE LAW requires the train speed achieve 200mph.) The price tag is too high. Non-electrification is a perfectly justifiable, effective and manageable means to reduce costs.</p> <p>One last comment: non-electrified track can, where appropriate, increase its productive use for limited, though revenue-generating freight train traffic. Come ride the Amtrak Cascades Talgo between Portland and Seattle. Even at only 80mph, you'll enjoy the ride.</p>	Please refer to Response to Comment W022-1.
W023-1	Mr. Mike Macarelli / VTA Light-Rail Operator / San Jose, CA	Pacheco Pass is the preferred corridor since Gilroy is the gateway to the Bay Area. Also, the Altamont Pass needs a line. No line between Irvine and San Diego was a mistake and will cost CA and the public.	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Please refer to the Authority's and FRA's certified statewide program EIR/EIS (November 2005) for the rationale for there being no direct HST line between Irvine and San Diego.</p>
W023-2	Mr. Mike Macarelli / VTA Light-Rail Operator / San Jose, CA	Use Japanese trains, overhead, switches, and control / communication systems since Japan builds the best cars-reliable, high-quality, and great resale.	Comment acknowledged. The selection of a manufacturer for the trainsets is beyond the scope of this Program EIR/EIS process. A manufacturer will be selected in the future if the HST project is implemented.
W024-1	Mr. Albert Kochaphum / San Francisco State / Student / San Francisco, CA	I feel that the Altamont Pass Alignment is the best option for the High Speed Rail project in the Bay Area because of how the Pacheco pass will serve to feed environmentally damaging suburban sprawl in the Los Banos and southern San Jose area. Already, San Jose is seen as a major sprawl urban area, with four major freeways, low density housing, and scarce public transportation ridership numbers dotting the area. Although, it does make sense to have some kind of service in San Jose, what is more important to the vitality of our state would be to develop density in the areas in which the commuters "already" exist, (like from Stockton and Livermore via the Altamont Pass-as shown with the daily traffic jams on I-580, and	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. There is no HST station at Los Banos.



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>heavy user ship on the Amtrak's Capital Corridor), rather than expect ridership to develop in places on where commuters are "projected" to exist, like the Southern San Jose/Los Banos area. It could be argued that the Capital Corridor could be used as a substitute for the Altamont pass, however, this neglects the fact that Capital Corridor service is a much different from what High Speed Rail would provide- both in terms of speed and frequency. If there are commuters are already in that area, it makes sense that there will be even more commuters when High Speed Rail gets built in that area. One of the main reasons that we desperately need a high speed rail project in California is because we need to be able to connect dense areas of the State together in a high efficiency system that creates an environmentally better alternative than driving and flying for these areas. In that respect, this environmentally friendly alternative should NOT create sprawl, by developing in undeveloped areas, such as Los Banos, and the Pacheco pass will definitely be a culprit for this. Even in the EIR document, it shows that the Pacheco pass would be more costly, and add travel time to trips originating from San Francisco to Sacramento. In considering all of those points above, and in closing, I strongly urge that the Altamont pass be chosen for the final alignment, NOT the Pacheco Pass. Thank you for your time in reading this comment.</p>	
W025-1	Mr. Bryant / San Jose, CA	High Speed Rail is a great idea it would help unify the state and would be a huge boost to the state's economy!	Comment acknowledged.
W025-2	Mr. Bryant / San Jose, CA	Heavy Rail transit stations have the largest impact on real estate values and are a much larger boost then light rail or other transit options.	Comment acknowledged.
W025-3	Mr. Bryant / San Jose, CA	<p>The fact of the matter is that California's population is still growing rapidly even though our transportation infrastructure has received little to no upgrades especially in northern California. Our airports are close to reaching their maximum capacity, and since none of the tree huggers allow us to build more airports or any expansion to our existing airports we must build high speed rail to help keep our state and our economy growing. Imagine how it would unify the state. A hockey fan in Fresno could hop on high speed rail at be at a Sharks game in 40 to 45 minutes. People could live in Los Angeles but work in San Jose. It would expand our markets and would be a catalyst for development around every station location. A European model of transit oriented development is a necessity to balance the strains on our local cities and maintain a robust economy. It is the natural evolution of West Coast cities that we are finally reaching critical mass and need to look at New York, Chicago, etc as a basis for development and transit strategies moving forward. Simply put we are running out of land and need to start building more high density developments.</p>	Comment acknowledged.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>I live and work in Downtown San Jose and I sold my car about six months ago. I am currently taking light rail which is a very clean safe and effective system. I am a huge fan of Silicon Valley's light rail. It is much cleaner and faster than San Francisco or other cities I have been in. The Bay Area as whole needs improvements in its transit system but you can more or less get anywhere you need to go it just make take a while. With Cal-Train and Amtrak Capitol Corridor and Ace Trains to Sacramento and Stockton northern California is well covered however, because of the grapevine and the mountains in L.A. there is no direct rail connection to So Cal. Most of my family is in Southern California and if there was a high speed rail system I would have no need to get a car at all. I would use the system all of the time if it where available. Let's start construction as soon as possible in my opinion.</p>	
W025-4	Mr. Bryant / San Jose, CA	<p>My one concern is over the choice of routes into the Bay Area. The Altamont pass option makes no sense and would have Fremont or Union City be the entry point/transfer station for the entire Bay Area which is ridiculous!</p> <p>Not only is the Pacheco Pass route geographically more sensible but it would increase the frequency of trains to the region's economic epicenter being San Jose/Silicon Valley. I would think service to S.F. and Oakland would be faster and more efficient with this route as well.</p> <p>The Altamont pass route is just politicians fighting for some constituent candy to hand out. It is absurd and it would require a multi Billion dollar bridge or tunnel over the Bay, which is not only financially impossible but strategically difficult with all of the environmentalist groups in SF & Berkeley who would complain and fight it in court.</p> <p>The Pacheco Pass South Bay route is definitely the way to go. Please use common sense and send the high speed rail down 152 and through Pacheco Pass into the Job Center of Silicon Valley.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>
W026-1	Mr. Tim Mac / San Jose, CA	<p>I vote for the Pacheco route in the Bay Area to Central high speed route. Tim.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>
W027-1	Mr. Andrew Samuelsen / Alameda, CA	<p>I think that the Altamont route, through Oakland, under the bay, through San Francisco and then to San Jose is best. It directly connects all trains through the 3 major hubs which is essential. The rail tube under the bay is essential to not only HSR, but BART, and other future extensions of existing rail services and new rail services. The Altamont pass area is better geared for growth and would benefit more</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>than the Pacheco pass route. The second best option is Altamont to San Jose to San Francisco. The third best is Altamont to Oakland to San Jose to San Francisco. All three cities must have all trains go through them. Don't split the trains.</p>	<p>Preferred Alternative.</p>
<p>W028-1</p>	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn / California State Parks, Natural Resources Division / Chief / Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>Dear Messrs. Leavitt and Valenstein:</p> <p>I am writing to request additional time to review the above-referenced DEIR/DEIS.</p> <p>The two-volume document plus additional supporting reference materials describe a project that has great interest and potential significant impact to California State Parks. The material is of such magnitude that additional time is absolutely necessary in order to prepare comments.</p> <p>The previous statewide document accommodated a 90 day comment period, even though much of the project was described in superficial and broad terms, deferring detailed descriptions to a later date. Because of the size and complexity of the California High Speed Rail Project, number of state park system units potentially affected, the controversial nature of certain elements of the plan and the newly re-considered Bay Area to Central Valley routes, I request that you extend the public review and comment period to November 16, 2007. This would give my staff an opportunity to more fully evaluate the relative merits and impacts of the proposed alternative routes. Granting this extension will allow for the critically-needed analysis of the project and give you an opportunity to benefit from the analysis and comments we will provide.</p> <p>You can reach me at 916-653-6725.</p> <p>Sincerely, Original signed by</p> <p>Richard G. Rayburn, Chief, Natural Resources Division</p>	<p>Please see Response to Comment O003-1.</p>
<p>W029-1</p>	<p>Mr. Scott Smith-McCurdy / UCSF MC/Self employed / IT Manager/ Massage therapist / San Francisco, CA</p>	<p>I support the Altamont Pass alignment into the Bay Area. It allows service to the Northern Central Valley and promises much better service possibilities to Sacramento. It better serves areas of high traffic congestion and projected ridership demands. It has a lower operating cost.</p> <p>It would avoid ecologically sensitive wetlands and farmland in the Los Banos area. Piggybacking on the Dumbarton rail crossing would have great benefits as well.</p> <p>I understand the mindset of the VTA and Silicon valley folks but don't agree with their arguments. It seems the Altamont Alignment would not change trip times significantly and would train schedules could be adjusted to meet demand. As one person pointed out at a public hearing there are benefits to getting on an empty train starting at Diridion Station as opposed to one where the prime seats have been filled</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>at stops up the peninsula.</p> <p>In the end getting the system built is more important than this alignment issue so thanks for considering my comments. Don't give up heart in the face of the Governor's ignorant actions and keep up the good work!</p> <p>Scott Smith-McCurdy</p>	
W030-1	Mrs. Beth Mallory / QC Lab Supervisor / Stockton, CA	<p>I currently commute 3 hours EACH way on the ACE train from Stockton to the Fremont station. When I have had to drive, it has taken me no less than 3 hours each way and that is leaving Stockton for Hayward at 5am and leaving Hayward for Stockton at 3:30pm.</p> <p>The ACE allows me to work on the train and my employer fortunately is flexible with this arrangement, but I know there are many others who are not so fortunate. Also, I try to do my part in cutting down on pollution and I believe that this is a small thing that would have a BIG impact on the environment, including air pollution.</p> <p>I see this proposal as being a wonderful opportunity, as it will allow me to have more time at home with my family.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>
W031-1	Pat Giorni / none / Retired / Burlingame, CA	<p>Gentlemen;</p> <p>Although I gave oral public comment at the August 27 Regional Rail Project workshop in San Carlos, I would like to amend that comment with the following:</p> <p>It is of paramount importance that the Governor not cut any further the budget of the California High Speed Rail Authority; and that a bond measure with the recommendation of the Pacheco Pass Alignment be placed on the November 2008 ballot.</p> <p>One of the major goals of this project is to alleviate intrastate highway and airport use between Los Angeles and the Bay Area. The Pacheco Pass option provides the best "relief" of the three major airports; and it would allow the High Speed Rail to incorporate the already publicly-owned Caltrain corridor. It would also serve to bring in the Federal funding necessary for grade separation in all three counties within the Caltrain/JPB jurisdiction.</p> <p>California has been and continues to be a leader in establishing transportation and air quality standards. With the vision of High Speed Rail we can be the innovator of a national and world-class mass transit system. We should not forget that it was the railroad that led to the expansion of this country "from sea to shining sea".</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		With respect, Patricia Hogan-Giorni	
W032-1	Edmundo Luna / San Francisco, CA	Please build the high speed rail ASAP!	Comment acknowledged.
W033-1	Fredrick Schermer / SFMTA / Transit Planner / San Francisco, CA	<p>This project has been underway for quite some time, and it is difficult to imagine a different track will be considered even when it turns out to be a much better track. Yet that is my comment. My biggest complaint about the current plan is that the current proposal does not deliver the best solution from an economic nor from a service perspective. I believe the proposed plan is made by planners without a solid economic background - or by people from a solid economic background other than transit. To make my case:</p> <p>San Francisco, though it is my home town, is not the economically best location in the Northern Bay Area to create a station. With it being situated on the tip of a peninsula any future expansion will be costly. San Francisco planners are already asking for a future link of the High-Speed Rail with Sacramento, an option only available through an estimated 4 billion dollar costing tunnel in today's money underneath the bay. All that expensive trouble with an easy cheaper solution readily available (to be explained below).</p> <p>Another economical argument is that a station in San Francisco will aggravate the current commuter and transit trends in place. With more people living in the northern section of the East Bay than in San Francisco, users of the High-Speed Rail will use BART to get to San Francisco during morning commute hours to get to the Transbay Terminal. That is a time when BART experiences its highest load factor. It is in the passengers' interest to commute in the opposite direction, an option that is also economically more sensible for the transit proprietors so the use of infrastructure already in place can be optimized.</p> <p>I do not complain about the high cost of the TransBay Terminal; it appears that the market forces will provide the city this terminal for 'free.' However, the market forces are already unwilling to definitively include the 40 million dollars needed for a high-quality pedestrian tunnel between the terminal and Muni/BART. These are minor but important details: passenger aggravations at such nodes contribute to fewer people using the High-Speed Rail.</p> <p>A solution, much easier to implement and much cheaper to build and expand, is circumventing the San Francisco station with a much cheaper station in West-Oakland (named: San Francisco Bay Station). From here, downtown San Francisco is a 7 minute ride on BART, and morning commuters on BART now in opposite direction will take this train towards Los Angeles and Sacramento. All users from the region</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Alternatives using the East Bay were considered but were not selected as preferred for this phase of the HST project.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>can commute to a central location in West-Oakland instead of having to go to already over-niched San Francisco. Morning commuters from Sacramento and Los Angeles will arrive in West-Oakland (after the morning rush) and finish their commute in all directions. Connecting the San Francisco Bay station (in West-Oakland) to Sacramento is far cheaper than the option that includes digging a tunnel underneath the bay, and it is positioned more centrally and is therefore far superior than the Transbay Terminal.</p>	
W033-2	<p>Fredrick Schermer / SFMTA / Transit Planner / San Francisco, CA</p>	<p>The other economic argument against the current proposal I like to make is that the Central Valley, too, will not get its most optimized version of High-Speed Rail. I propose an adjustment that makes better use of economies of scale, and in order to do so, I must first point to the big population gap between Los Angeles and the Bay Area. Though the Eastern Central Valley has a growing population, it is dispersed and automobile dependent. No parking lot large enough can optimize the use of the High-Speed Rail in this segment. Because, that is the beauty of dense population areas: people come by transit en masse from many directions, making the rail system viable. To create the same situation at the geographical heart of the High-Speed line, the High-Speed Rail Authority should consider creating/upgrading the current rail from Sacramento and Mid-Central Valley to San Luis Obispo, and align the High-Speed Rail to the most Western part of the Central Valley (straight line from San Jose to Bakersfield). Where both lines connect, near Coalinga, a mature connecting station will start to exist between Los Angeles and the Bay Area. This station will support the High-Speed Rail appropriately, while ensuring a minimum of stops and the shortest time between both metropolitan areas. With California a tremendously fast growing state, a more densely built city of 1 or 2 million people could even be envisioned here in the Western Central Valley. If the High-Speed Rail Authority is smart, it would buy truly large swaths of land near this self-designated station, and help develop such a city. The profits of this urban development could further help finance the California High-Speed Rail.</p> <p>A High-Speed Rail that makes the straightest line between San Diego, Los Angeles, Bakersfield, San Jose, San Francisco Bay Station (in West-Oakland), and Sacramento is the fastest rail. It is possible to make this the TGV of California. A rail line, fast in the order of Germany's ICE, between San Luis Obispo, the High Speed Rail station near Coalinga, Fresno, Sacramento, Chico, and Redding, makes for a high quality supportive element in what then becomes a more economically attractive overall product, one that delivers faster, better and more service to more Californians.</p> <p>Single rail lines tend to be expensive rail lines; multiple rail lines bring down cost. Only when rail lines make high quality connections to other rail lines do the costs come down. Memphis with a single light rail system sees very low returns on its</p>	<p>This comment is beyond the scope of this Program EIR/EIS. Please refer to the FRA's and Authority's certified statewide program EIR/EIS (November 2005).</p>



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>investments; New York with its system of subway lines fares three times better compare to cost. The beauty of it all is that connecting the high speed rail to the hearts of high quality rail systems (and that is Oakland in the Bay Area), and creating the best economic opportunities (such as a station where the high speed line and the rail between San Luis Obispo and Fresno meet), the passengers actually end up benefiting the most. The best economic solutions are the ones that benefit the passengers on average best. And more users means the High-Speed Rail proprietor benefits most as well. For its own sake, and for how future users will look back on the planners of today, it is important that the High-Speed Rail Authority considers the future as a real aspect of this project today.</p> <p>The current proposal is too much a political proposal. Admitted immediately, the system will never be viable all by itself, but there is a difference between the operations of the project costing more and this costing less. By starting out with going for the best possible economic option, the best possible solution for passengers and California will surface. Too much politics makes for less wise solutions. Somehow, transit agencies have competition on their minds when dealing with each other instead of seeing the car and the plane as their real competitors (See: BART and Caltrans not connecting at the heart of the BART system, an economically incomprehensible choice). Also, planners have too much the car on their minds without understanding that High-Speed Rail is like the eagle of transit: without an appropriate eco-system to sustain this animal, it will fail to meet its future challenges. Substituting the eco-system by providing large amounts of man-produced foods (or for High-Speed Rail, man-driven cars and parking lots) will automatically change the nature of the beast in a negative direction.</p> <p>That is my complaint: this plan is inferior from an economic point of view and from a service point of view. I have no doubts about the good intentions, but the current plan shows that the planners are not knowledgeable enough about transit and High-Speed Rail in particular.</p>	
W034-1	Mr. Brian Nores / San Francisco, CA	<p>PLEASE!!! Get this moving; time is money and time is pollution.</p> <p>NO MORE DELAYS!</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Comment acknowledged.
W035-1	David & Anne Cehrs / Sanger, CA	<p>We prefer the Altamont Pass alignment alternative. Altamont is already impacted with multiple roads, rails, power lines, etc.</p> <p>Altamont is a wider canyon and has more room to place the high speed rail line within the canyon. It has a lower elevation and thus would be less energy intensive</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>to get the trains over the pass. It is the less expensive alternative - good.</p> <p>We do not like the Pacheco Pass alternative. It would cost more, the canyon is narrow with less room for the rail line, it has a greater elevation gain and would require more energy to cross. In addition the proposed Pacheco Pass alternatives routes across the San Joaquin Valley would impact both state and federal wildlife refuges and wetland sanctuaries. It would also require more expenses to mitigate floodplain problems and have a greater impact on farmlands.</p> <p>Again we prefer the Altamont Pass alignment.</p>	<p>Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.</p>
W036-1	Mr. John Honnette / Environmental Health Specialist / Kingsburg, CA	<p>I believe that the Altamont Pass is a much better location than Pacheco Pass for the High Speed Rail Alignment for the following reasons:(1) The trip from Sacramento to the Bay Area would be shorter, (2) The systemwide O & M costs for the Pacheco Pass network alternatives are approximately \$80 million more than the Altamont Pass network alternatives serving the same markets, (3) The Altamont Pass connection between the Bay Area and the Central Valley would serve to connect all the Central Valley cities from Bakersfield to Sacramento, an area of rapid growth. The High Speed Rail would very likely contribute to "densification" of Central Valley cities rather than contributing to additional sprawl, (4) The Altamont Pass is an already disrupted corridor with numerous railways and highways. The High Speed Rail would provide another transportation alternative in this congested corridor and encourage growth in already populated areas, (5) The Pacheco Pass Alignment would likely impede wildlife movement corridors in the largest contiguous block of wetlands in the Central Valley, including state and federal wildlife refuges. The rail corridor will have an 8-foot high chain-link fence on both sides of the tracks, sound barriers in some areas, 25-foot towers carrying the electrical lines, and electrical substations at 15-to-30 mile intervals, and lastly (6) The Pacheco Pass Alignment would have greater farmland and floodplain impacts than the Altamont Pass Alignment. For the above reasons, I believe the High Speed Rail should be built through the much more highly developed and lower elevation Altamont Pass rather than through the less developed, higher, narrower and more rugged Pacheco Pass.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.</p>
W037-1	Mr. Jeff Andrews / Sunnyvale, CA	<p>After looking at the draft copy of the EIS/EIR, it seems that the best alignment for minimizing cost and maximizing ridership and revenue is to implement one of the Altamont based alignments.</p> <p>The two pieces of data that made this pretty clear to me:</p> <p>Maximizing ridership and minimizing construction costs seem like really clear goals to me. The ratio of ridership/construction cost was very high for all the Pacheco pass</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Terminating the HST system in Union City or San Jose were considered but rejected as these alternatives do not meet the purpose and need of the</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>alternatives compared to the Altamont pass ones.</p> <p>The Pacheco pass alternatives had significantly longer transit times to Sacramento, for really no added user value.</p> <p>Thus, I think it is pretty clear that the Pacheco alternatives should be discarded.</p> <p>Next, among the Altamont alternatives (mostly about how much to connect to San Jose, Oakland, and SF), this was far less clear.</p> <p>However, looking at the ridership/cost again, it would appear the best solution would be either terminating only in Union City or San Jose. I would suggest San Jose despite slightly higher cost versus Union City because San Jose would connect better to Caltrain on the peninsula and there would still be a BART connection possible in Livermore or Pleasanton or Fremont without a Union City station. By connecting to both BART and Caltrain to implement the Bay Area network, the result would be very cost effective.</p>	<p>proposed HST system. Please see Chapter 8 of this Final Program EIR/EIS.</p>
W037-2	Mr. Jeff Andrews / Sunnyvale, CA	<p>Also, while I live much closer to Palo Alto than any of the other station alternatives, I would highly recommend against a station in Palo Alto. Palo Alto would be unlikely to be very receptive to adding high density growth near the station and Palo Alto's very anti-car street design make driving on Palo Alto streets to a station painful. Palo Alto is not a large city and most people would probably need to drive cars or take taxis to the station. This kind of car traffic would be unwelcome and painful in Palo Alto. The situation in San Jose would be much better.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. The Preferred Alternative identifies a potential HST station in either Palo Alto or Redwood City. Project-level environmental analysis will be necessary to determine a preferred site (and whether to have a mid-Peninsula HST station).</p>
W037-3	Mr. Jeff Andrews / Sunnyvale, CA	<p>Frankly, a very key item for deciding the ultimate Bay Area stations and terminus should be the given city's willingness to add lots of new high density development near the station, lots of free/cheap parking, efficient intermodal station, and very good freeway connectivity to get riders efficiently to the station.</p> <p>I believe that despite the desire to have a all-rail connectivity from user to local train to HST, many users will need to drive since the local train will be too painful to make use of. By painful, I mean wasteful of time and out of the way to get to a station.</p> <p>Further, I think a selection criteria around how many airports the HST connects to is unnecessary. Local trains can connect the airports to the HST. At SFO there is BART, so just make sure BART efficiently connects to HST. I remember having to take such local trains in Europe from airports and paying for HST infrastructure for short distances to taxi people parallel to existing BART or Caltrain seems wasteful of construction cost.</p> <p>Note that the smaller Bay Area cities like Palo Alto and Redwood City have been</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. The Authority and FRA disagree with the commenter's belief that it is not desirable to connect the HST system with California's major airports (please see Chapter 1, "Purpose and Need"). Please also see Response to Comment W037-2.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>historically very poor at adding high density development, parking, or efficient freeway connections. I'm not as familiar with the east bay smaller cities and whether they attempt to maximize these expensive type mass transit projects or not, but in the peninsula and south bay, I find it highly unlikely that the smaller towns would get over their NIMBY approach to high density development enough to maximize the investment to bring stations to their towns. San Jose would be the best bet as a result.</p> <p>Best wishes on bringing this to fruition, Jeff</p>	
W038-1	Mr. Andrew Gross / Calif State Auto Assn / Auto Travel Product Analyst / Union City, CA	<p>Please approve the Pacheco route for these reasons:</p> <p>With Pacheco, up to three times more trains will stop in San Jose versus Altamont. And 50% more trains will go to San Francisco and Oakland. Altamont is inefficient. The faster passengers can go their destinations, the more likely they will choose HSR over flying or driving. Pacheco means less travel time between the largest city in Southern California and the largest city in Northern California.</p> <p>The primary purpose of HSR is long-distance travel -- not short-distance commuting. Amtrak and ACE already provide rail service from Sacramento and the Central Valley to the Bay Area. HSR would merely duplicate already-existing service.</p> <p>(My comments constitute my personal opinion and do not represent a CSAA position.)</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W039-1	Mr. James Lartigue / Los Banos, CA	We need the HST to go along Hwy 152 to reduce the traffic along that corridor & cut down on pollution.	Comment acknowledged.
W040-1	Mr. Jonathan McComb / college student / Merced, CA	It should go through the Altamont Pass. It will be quicker for Merced and surrounding counties.	Comment acknowledged.
W041-1	Mrs. Bettie Harrison / Disabled HR manager / Atwater, CA	<p>My retired husband and I support the Altamont Pass route. We travel to S F and vicinity for specialized medical care not available in the Central Valley, as well as visiting relatives.</p> <p>We do about 20-30 trips a year, 95% over Altamont Pass. Most of those trips could be done on a train linking to BART using the Altamont route, saving us gas, and saving the environment from vehicle pollution. Many others from the San Joaquin Valley we know also go over Altamont for shopping, medical care, etc. Many people from our area work in the Bay Area, and most seem to use Altamont.</p> <p>We understand the Altamont Pass route is doable with less environmental impact</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		than the more pristine Pacheco Pass. We strongly encourage that route.	
W042-1	Damien Boesch / San Jose, CA	<p>I absolutely support the high speed rail path to San Francisco that follows the Pacheco pass. To me, it's a no-brainer. California desperately needs this high speed rail system as fast as possible at the lowest cost. Although your reports allege that the cost of the Altamont pass and Pacheco pass are nearly identical, these studies must be false. How can a NEW bridge or transbay tunnel across the bay cost under 15 million dollars alone? Construction to cross the bay will take many more years than a simple over-land route. Finally, these construction projects will destroy bay wetland habitats.</p> <p>The Pacheco pass route will not be hampered by these problems. It will accelerate the implementation of rail in California. The Altamont pass route can be built after the success of high speed rail is proven.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W043-1	Mr. Jason Long / English Professor / Merced, CA	<p>I am writing this note to argue strongly in favor of the Altamont pass route into the Bay Area, rather than the Los Banos/Pacheco pass route. One key reason is the rapid growth of the northern Central Valley. Areas like Turlock, Modesto, Stockton, Tracy and others are growing at astonishing rates - especially when compared to cities inside the greater Bay Area - and I think it is important that these areas be as "connected" to the Bay as possible. Also, when you consider the job situation, many Valley residents currently work in the East Bay and commute by car to areas like Tracy, Stockton, and even some I know all the way to Modesto! This connection could make a huge difference in their lives, and bring in MORE riders for the trains. The other route goes through mostly empty farmland, the largest town being Los Banos which is about one-tenth the size of Modesto, and will force all travelers into the South Bay. The issue there is that while I know that San Jose is the largest "city" in the Bay Area, the East Bay is by far the largest side of the Bay. As a Merced resident I know many who commute regularly into the East Bay for work or entertainment or other activities, and literally none who go from here to San Jose to work or play. If the goal of the high-speed train is to save money, then it should be built out through the middle of nowhere; however, if the goal is to have the highest ridership possible, and to serve the most people, the route without question needs to head up through the north Central Valley and over the Altamont Pass into the East Bay. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W044-1	Neil Shea / Product Manager / Newark, CA	<p>Congratulations and thank you for the determined work of the Authority. This project is sorely needed and creates such a huge opportunity to keep California at the economic forefront of the nation and beyond.</p>	Comment acknowledged.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W044-2	Neil Shea / Product Manager / Newark, CA	<p>The route alignment you have defined is outstanding. Understandably, Bay Area geography and politics have mitigated for special consideration of this important region. Besides San Francisco and SFO Airport, it offers a number of secondary destinations which might be included on an HSR route, initially or later.</p> <p>Obviously not all cities and people will be delighted with whatever selection the Authority makes. And clearly HSR is not the only train. By definition, HSR succeeds with direct routes through the most target rich alignments and by strong interconnections.</p> <p>As with the Inland Empire and Los Angeles, the largest and worst commutes are from the San Joaquin Valley to the Bay Area through the Altamont Pass I-580 corridor. This offers the biggest opportunity for HSR ridership, as well as to play an important part in relieving local congestion. One very direct route could come in along the I-580/238 corridor, near the OAK Airport, and then across a new Bay bridge or tunnel past SFO Airport and on to SF.</p> <p>Meanwhile, while San Jose has a large population, unfortunately the residents and employers are not concentrated where they are easily served by train. Construction along the Peninsula would be extremely expensive, and would encounter strong local opposition. And ironically, the biggest commute pattern into Silicon Valley is from the Tri-Valley (Pleasanton/San Ramon) and Joaquin County.</p> <p>I would like to weigh in, in strong favor of an Altamont Pass route because of the much greater ridership potential, plus the avoidance of sensitive environment of Pacheco Pass, and the avoidance of political opposition of Peninsular residents. If we could have a short direct route past OAK and SFO airports on the way to the Transbay Terminal, that would be ideal.</p> <p>Thank you again for all your worthwhile efforts.</p> <p>Regards, Neil Shea, Newark, CA</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>
W045-1	Celeste Garamendi / TRAQC / Health Care Management Consultant / Tracy, CA	<p>Dear Members of the CHSRA and Staff:</p> <p>I live in Tracy, California and work with local citizens, including through TRAQC - a local alliance of concerned citizens - to promote SMART growth policies in the City of Tracy, San Joaquin County and the region.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W045-2	Celeste Garamendi / TRAQC / Health Care Management Consultant / Tracy, CA	We are pleased that the California High Speed Rail Authority held an additional hearing in the northern San Joaquin Valley regarding the route of the high speed rail line.	Comment acknowledged.
W045-3	Celeste Garamendi / TRAQC / Health Care Management Consultant / Tracy, CA	<p>We have followed the development of the California High Speed Rail system and are familiar with the route options being considered. While we are not addressing the specific track placement at this time within each city, we do want to address the general route being considered.</p> <p>We strongly support the high speed rail system and placement of the high speed rail system along the existing urban growth corridor along HWY 99, across HWY 120 and I-205 and over the Altamont Pass into the center of the Bay Area. There are several reasons why the 99-120-205-Altamont route is the best alternative for the State of California and the region. The 99-120-205-Altamont Pass route:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Places the rail line closest to existing urban populations along HWY 99, HWY 120 and I-205, maximizing potential ridership Facilitates maximum use of existing rail right of ways to support development Provides the best route to serve the majority of the State with closer service to Sacramento and less cost to complete the rail line to Sacramento Drops the high speed rail line into the center of the Bay Area which better serves the entire Bay Area region and those traveling to the Bay Area and provides more efficient linkages to regional transportation systems Maximizes the economic development potential by serving a larger population more efficiently Minimizes the environmental impacts (loss of ag land, open space, critical habitat; helps address mobile air quality in San Joaquin Valley which is second worst in country, reduces growth inducing impacts of project) of the rail system by using existing developed and populated areas along the existing highly urbanized corridors Promotes needed more concentrated infill or core contiguous development along existing urban corridors which also minimizes environmental impacts and promotes more efficient resource use and future development Prevents sprawling residential development across and along the I-5 west side of the Central Valley that will generate new environmental impacts and exacerbate existing problems associated with such sprawl development <p>The benefits of the 99-120-205-Altamont Pass route are clearly superior to the</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>Pacheco Pass alternative being considered. We best serve the State, the entire Bay Area, and the Central Valley by placing the route along the existing most densely populated corridors. In the long term this alternative saves money and significantly reduces costly growth inducing impacts associated with other routes that cross over to the I-5 west side of the valley. With the 99-120-205-Altamont route we save taxpayer money, promote SMART growth, limit environmental impacts, and maximize the economic development potential of the system.</p> <p>Sincerely, Celeste M. Garamendi</p>	
W046-1	Mr. Bruce Carter / Civil Engineer / Tracy, CA	<p>The noise and vibration impacts from any of the Tracy Downtown station routes will significantly affect the quality of life and economic value of existing homes and commercial development in the vicinity of these routes. Home values will plummet creating areas of urban blight. The current ACE train alignment, while offering a similar plight, is already an established, active rail corridor which is addressed by local land use planning.</p> <p>The Pacheco alternatives provide a true HST alternative. The alignments proposed through Tracy would only supplement an existing heavy rail (ACE) operation and would provide no additional benefits over ACE, while greatly increasing the operating cost of the system.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W047-1	Mr. Alexander Lew / Urban School of San Francisco / student / San Francisco, CA	<p>California is in need of a high speed rail system. As the state's population continues to grow, more and more cars are being added to already congested highways, resulting in more exhaust, pollution, gridlock, longer commutes, and stress. High speed rail, although expensive, is an effective way to solve traffic problems. Trains do not have to fight bad images, as do buses. High speed rail can open up various economical benefits as commuting between north and south will become easier. Taiwan's high speed rail, or the gao tie, has already opened up several economical opportunities for smaller towns in the south. France's TGV makes traveling much easier and efficient. Eurostar just opened up a new rail alignment from the Channel Tunnel to the London, cutting down an extra 20 minutes off the current 2 hour and 30 minute train ride between London and Paris. So many countries are investing in bullet train travel yet the United States remains still in the highways and roads era.</p>	Comment acknowledged.
W047-2	Mr. Alexander Lew / Urban School of San Francisco / student / San Francisco, CA	<p>The Altamont alignment provides transit options for cities that are not currently served by Caltrain or BART. I, for that reason, support the Altamont alignment. If someone from Gilroy needs to get to San Francisco, Sacramento, or Los Angeles, Caltrain can provide the connection to San Jose, and then from there high speed trains do the rest of the work. Livermore is currently not served by BART, but they pay BART taxes. Extending high speed rail to Livermore will allow commuters from</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>that town to leave cars at home and take the train to the city. The Altamont alignment also will relieve congestion off BART's East Bay trunk line on the Fremont and Dublin lines. Fremont bound passengers will be able to take high speed rail into San Francisco via another route. The same line will be able to link up Sacramento with San Francisco without having to go in an excessively round-about way.</p> <p>High speed rail is a way of combating global warming, and I look forward to a day when people can board a train at Transbay and arrive at Union Station in Los Angeles two hours later.</p>	
W048-1	Mr. Arthur Valderrama / Alameda County Public Works Agency / Supervising Civil Engineer / Hayward, CA	<p>The Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) and the Alameda County Public Works Agency (Agency) have reviewed your draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR/EIS) for the subject project. The District and Agency have the following comments.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS:</p>	Comment acknowledged.
W048-2	Mr. Arthur Valderrama / Alameda County Public Works Agency / Supervising Civil Engineer / Hayward, CA	<p>The project as proposed will encroach on creeks, flood plains and channels at various locations throughout Alameda County. The District and Agency would request a detailed project level discussion on these encroachment locations under subsequent EIR (Public Resources Code Section 2116) and CEQA guidelines Section 15162 and 15163 project level analysis prior to issuing encroachment permit for the project.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative does not go through Alameda County.
W048-3	Mr. Arthur Valderrama / Alameda County Public Works Agency / Supervising Civil Engineer / Hayward, CA	<p>Segments of the proposed alignment of the High Speed rail tracks potentially will be located in areas that may be subject to the effects of climate change (global warming) resulting in rise in sea levels that could affect many areas along the bay shore. This should be thoroughly discussed</p>	Please see Section 3.3 of this Final Program EIR/EIS document. The HST project will have a net benefit in terms of air quality impacts (reduces CO ₂ and other greenhouse gases emissions).
W048-4	Mr. Arthur Valderrama / Alameda County Public Works Agency / Supervising Civil Engineer / Hayward, CA	<p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</p> <p>The EIR/EIR identified potential impacts from the project implementation. However, the EIR/EIR deferred in-depth discussion to a later time when detailed project level subsequent EIR/EIS would be prepared identifying impacts and mitigation. The general impact areas within Alameda County that would have to be responded to include:</p>	Comment acknowledged.
W048-5	Mr. Arthur Valderrama / Alameda County Public Works Agency / Supervising Civil	<p>Potential effects on biological resources at various locations i.e.; red legged frog; San Joaquin Kit fox; California Tiger salamander; Steelhead; Alameda Whipsnakes; and several species of plants; wetlands etc.</p>	Comment acknowledged.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
	Engineer / Hayward, CA		
W048-6	Mr. Arthur Valderrama / Alameda County Public Works Agency / Supervising Civil Engineer / Hayward, CA	Potential impacts on Flood Control Channel/Creek and road Crossings	Comment acknowledged.
W048-7	Mr. Arthur Valderrama / Alameda County Public Works Agency / Supervising Civil Engineer / Hayward, CA	Potential noise and vibration impacts in urban centers	Comment acknowledged.
W048-8	Mr. Arthur Valderrama / Alameda County Public Works Agency / Supervising Civil Engineer / Hayward, CA	Potential impacts on Cultural Resources	Comment acknowledged.
W048-9	Mr. Arthur Valderrama / Alameda County Public Works Agency / Supervising Civil Engineer / Hayward, CA	Potential impacts to the quarry pits in Pleasanton and eventually to the Zone 7 aquifer recharge program in the event material removed from tunnel construction through the ridges between Pleasanton and Fremont/Union City will be dumped locally in the area.	Comment acknowledged.
W049-1	Mr. Michael Katz / Berkeley, CA	<p>(1) I believe the EIR is incomplete in not evaluating an alternative between the No Project and HST alternatives. This intermediate alternative would involve incremental improvements in existing Amtrak facilities and service within California, to gradually increase travel speed and connectivity.</p> <p>Rationale: It seems likely that, in practice, the HST alternatives will never reach their promised speeds. Trains will be slowed by a profusion of intermediate stations, and by the need to reduce speeds within urban areas.</p> <p>Meanwhile, Amtrak service is limping along with little new capital investment, and a bus bridge between San Luis Obispo and Bakersfield. The diversion of funds to a new, separate rail network might actually harm rail alternatives in the short run, and postpone the arrival of faster, workable service between major Northern and Southern California cities.</p> <p>The difference between effective HST speeds, and an upgraded Amtrak network, might turn out not to be that great. The latter could be achieved sooner, at lower cost. Does the HSR authority not need to evaluate this option and these presumptions?</p>	This comment is beyond the scope of this Program EIR/EIS. This alternative was considered and rejected as part of the Authority's and FRA's certified statewide program EIR/EIS (November 2005). Please refer to that document.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W049-2	Mr. Michael Katz / Berkeley, CA	(2) By most environmental, operational, and economic criteria, the clearly preferable alternative among those studied appears to be an Altamont Pass alignment with termini in San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland. Additionally, the preferable subalternatives would be those with stations located in each city's central downtown, and with direct, high-speed connections among those stations.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W049-3	Mr. Michael Katz / Berkeley, CA	<p>(3) I urge HSR sponsors to consider how little net benefit this project appears to offer Bay Area stakeholders, and to therefore select project alternatives that would provide the highest, most visible benefits in terms of connectivity, accessibility, and convenience.</p> <p>Reasons why HSR offers limited net benefit to the Bay Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Perception that this HSR network would primarily connect Los Angeles to Central Valley cities, with the Bay Area a second-class "spur." * Perception that HSR would promote job creation in Central Valley cities, at the expense of built-up coastal cities with persistent unemployment problems. * Perception that a subsidized HSR system would benefit a somewhat elite ridership of business travelers. * Perception that funding an HSR network would inevitably require increases in the state's regressive, already-high sales tax. * Overall nightmare scenario: Middle- and low-income coastal residents would end up paying higher taxes to subsidize the export of their jobs to lower-cost cities in the Central Valley. <p>To mitigate this perception, I believe HSR sponsors need to offer Bay Area cities tangible, transparent benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Altamont Pass service directly to all three major Bay Area cities -- San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland. * San Francisco station centrally located at the Transbay Terminal. * Oakland station centrally located at Oakland City Center/12th Street. * Provide a direct, high-speed connection between San Francisco and Oakland downtowns, via bridge or tube. * Provide direct service to both San Francisco and Oakland international airports (see below). 	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative includes HST stations at the Transbay Transit Center in downtown San Francisco and Diridon Station in downtown San Jose. The Authority and FRA believe that the proposed HST system offers great benefits to California and the Bay Area. The HST connection to the Bay Area is <u>not</u> a spur line. The link between the Bay Area and southern California has the greatest frequency of HST service and the highest ridership. The Authority has identified this segment as the first phase in its phasing plan. The link to the Bay Area would not be a "second-class spur," and there would be no proposed statewide HST system without this link.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W049-4	Mr. Michael Katz / Berkeley, CA	(4) Any airport connection should be USABLE: a station located directly within the airport, and at most one "hop" from the departure level (either a change of level or a short shuttle ride, but not both). Positive models: Train stations at Copenhagen's Kastrup airport or Amsterdam's Schipol airport. In each case, you bring your luggage cart up a single slanted ramp, and you're in the terminal. Negative example: the BART SFO station. For domestic flights, this station requires five changes of level (a huge deterrent for passengers with heavy luggage), plus a slow, time-consuming ride on a shuttle train.	Comment acknowledged.
W049-5	Mr. Michael Katz / Berkeley, CA	(5) Consider no route with any measurable impacts on the Grassland Ecological Area (GEA). Respectfully yours, Michael Katz	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011 in regards to the Grasslands Ecological Area.
W050-1	Mr. George Heath / San Jose, CA	Howdy! My brother and I would love to see high speed rail in California. Besides the fact that we are long overdue for such a service, it would be one step closer to real transportation alternatives for the 21st century, a place where we as a state and as a country lag behind the rest of the modern world. We are classic car enthusiasts, and many times there are shows taking place in the southern part of the state that we would like to go to, but the cost of doing so in terms of fuel, tires, maintenance, etc. make it impractical. Thank you, George Heath & Jason Heath	Comment acknowledged.
W051-1	Ms. Kate Godfrey / Palo Alto, CA	I urge the CHRSA to choose the Altamont Pass over the Pacheco alternative as the preferred route into the Bay Area, for four compelling reasons. (1) Farmland: The Altamont Pass route would have considerably less negative impact on farmland. (2) Species: The Altamont Pass route would have considerably less negative impact on species. (3) Wetlands: The Altamont Pass route would not reduce wetlands as much as the	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>Pacheco route.</p> <p>(4) Ridership: To make a dent in the global emissions problem, it is important not to create disincentives to using the San Francisco-Sacramento and Oakland-Sacramento routes. There would be a substantially more robust ridership on these trips if they follow the significantly faster Altamont route.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
W052-1	Mr. Dave Snyder / SPUR, SF Chamber of Commerce / San Francisco, CA	<p>Dear Authority Members:</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of San Francisco Planning + Urban Research and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. We have reviewed the Draft Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train (HST) Program EIR/EIS and have the following comments.</p> <p>We would like to commend the analysis for its thorough review of the environmental impacts of California high speed rail. The document makes it clear that the benefits of high speed rail far outstrip the impacts if the system serves the major urban centers, especially San Francisco's proposed Transbay Transit Center.</p>	Comment acknowledged. The Preferred Alternative includes the Transbay Transit Center.
W052-2	Mr. Dave Snyder / SPUR, SF Chamber of Commerce / San Francisco, CA	<p>We do note one critical deficiency, which we understand is a result of the timeline of this analysis. The EIR/EIS did not analyze the financial and operating implications of high speed rail in conjunction with the financial and operating implications of the regional rail system. The final EIR/EIS should address this deficiency by indicating the potential for cost savings and operational changes in the regional rail system that would result from different alternatives of high speed rail, as well as different construction phasing schedules.</p> <p>Those implications are huge. As the document notes, a certain degree of local and regional service can be provided on the same tracks that carry high speed rail express trains. Investments in high speed rail should take into account the collateral benefits to local and regional service, and the final EIR/EIS should analyze these benefits.</p>	The identification of the Preferred Alternative did take into consideration the Bay Area Regional Rail Plan and the findings of this study. The Authority and FRA believe that the Preferred Alternative is consistent with the findings of the Bay Area Regional Rail Study. A detailed analysis of the financial and operating implications of the HST system in conjunction with the financial and operational implications of the regional rail system is beyond the level of detail provided in the Bay Area Regional Rail Plan and the scope of this Program EIR/EIS.
W052-3	Mr. Dave Snyder / SPUR, SF Chamber of Commerce / San Francisco, CA	<p>We look forward to further analysis and to the expedited construction of high speed rail for California. Please feel free to call SPUR's Transportation Policy Director Dave Snyder at (415) 781-8726, ext. 135 if you have any questions about these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jim Lazarus</p>	Comment acknowledged.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Dave Snyder San Francisco Planning + Urban Research	
W053-1	Mr. Nicholas Farmer / Albany, CA	If done properly, this rail service could provide enormous benefits for the state of California, economically, environmentally, and culturally. I wholeheartedly support this plan!	Comment acknowledged.
W054-1	Mr. Erik Alm / Fremont, CA	California's rail heritage should not be displaced by this latest generation of rail; do not route High Speed Rail through Niles Canyon in a way that would disrupt the existing historic Niles Canyon Railway service. The Niles Canyon Railway (NCRY) utilizes a historic rail corridor through Niles Canyon between unincorporated Sunol and the Niles District of Fremont. NCRY is a critical element of economic and community redevelopment in these historic rail communities that have struggled economically in recent decades. Eliminating NCRY would be a death blow to decades of economic and community redevelopment activities that have centered on the NCRY and other historic rail elements as an anchor. Please redirect the HSR alignment to the Pacheco Pass for these reasons, as well as the more direct routing through San Jose that the Pacheco Pass alignment provides.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W055-1	Mr. Kenneth Mayes / Concerned Citizen / Engineer / Sacramento, CA	<p>In all of my days of evaluating capital projects, I have never seen a document as shallow as the one presented with this proposal. The energy use analysis is grounds to have the project start from zero and produce something that is feasible.</p> <p>The projected increase of 23MM BBLs of oil use by this project is in direct opposition to AB32 that requires a net decrease by 2020. The ARB is charged with reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% of 1990 levels by 2050. It doesn't take a mental giant to see that all of the energy requirements for this project must be self generated from renewable resources and offsets must be purchased for materials and construction which will increase the Capital requirement by orders of magnitude. In any case, the unit increases for VMT must be recalculated based on current plans to increase State CAFE standards by 2020. This removes most of the projected energy savings for this project and it loses the rest of when you assume that BART loses its customers to the HST.</p>	Please see Standard Responses 1 and 2. Please refer to Sections 3.3 and 3.5; the proposed HST system is expected to result in a net reduction in energy use, with resulting benefit for air quality. Potential short-term construction impacts for energy and air quality are also presented in Sections 3.3 and 3.5. The unit increases for vehicle miles traveled (VMT) take into account future increases in CAFE standards.
W055-2	Mr. Kenneth Mayes / Concerned Citizen / Engineer / Sacramento, CA	I find it difficult to understand how the HST will prevent any increase in airplane VMT over the plan 20 year period...I assume that HST will carry all of the new intrastate air traffic. This is bad news for the billions of dollars that are being spent to increase capacity in the States airports. Decreasing airline miles does improve customer	The HST system would divert a considerable amount of intrastate air traffic. Nevertheless, most of the air traffic at our major commercial airports is to other markets. Most of California's major airports are approaching



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		savings for fixed investments...it just robs one tax entity and gives to another.	capacity and diverting intrastate air traffic is viewed by the Authority and FRA as a major benefit.
W055-3	Mr. Kenneth Mayes / Concerned Citizen / Engineer / Sacramento, CA	A quick analysis shows a ticket cost of about \$35 per ride to pay for the op and capital costs before capitalizing required energy production. I am sure that the BAY AREA will be happy to pay 7 times the going rate to get to stations at the same speed as they have now. Surely you don't think that these trains are going for zero to 200 mph to zero in less than 7 minutes.	The Authority and FRA do not agree with this "quick analysis." The ridership and revenue forecasts and operational analysis conclude that revenue from passengers will substantially exceed operational and maintenance costs. Please refer to the Authority's June 2000 Business Plan and recent financial planning work available on the Authority's website (www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov). No, the HST trains are not assumed to go from "zero to 200 mph to zero in less than 7 minutes."
W055-4	Mr. Kenneth Mayes / Concerned Citizen / Engineer / Sacramento, CA	In summary, there is not a rational number in the entire presentation and you can expect a few hundred law suits (including the AG) if you continue on this basis.	Comment acknowledged.
W056-1	Ms. Kim Forrest / Los Banos, CA	<p>I am writing to urge the HSRA to abandon all proposals for a Pacheco Pass alignment.</p> <p>A Pacheco Pass alignment would bisect the priceless California landscapes of the Pacheco Pass area of the Diablo Range and the Grasslands located between Los Banos and Merced. The Grasslands provides critical wintering habitat for migratory birds, including 20% of the Pacific Flyway waterfowl population. Waterfowl populations average a half-million, with peak numbers up to one million. Hundreds of thousands of shorebirds migrate through the area. The Grasslands provides habitat for more than 550 species of plants and animals, including 47 species that are endangered, threatened, or candidate species under state or federal law.</p> <p>In recognition of the rich and critically important natural resources of the Grasslands, conservation agencies and groups have focused more attention and funding on this area than most areas of the State. There are two U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service national wildlife refuges and a conservation easement program that encompasses 75,000 acres on 180 separate private properties, six California Department of Fish and Game wildlife areas, a California Department of Parks and Recreation state park, and an extremely active Natural Resources Conservation Service program. This area has garnered numerous habitat restoration and enhancement grants totaling millions of dollars, and is one of the most active areas for conservation group involvement.</p>	Acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011. There will be no Los Banos station as part of the HST system. Please also see Chapter 8 and the Summary.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>This area is a small remnant of the once vast historic Central Valley wetlands. Yet, the HSRA proposes to further degrade this priceless piece of the California landscape. The EIR/S continues to propose a Pacheco Pass alignment that bisects this jewel of the Diablo Range and bisects the Grasslands through its middle or runs immediately adjacent to it along its northern boundary and fragments a portion of it. Both of these alignments would cause unrecognized damage.</p> <p>The physical description of a typical track layout - with a 50- to 100-foot right-of-way ("comparable to a six-land highway"), 8-foot chain-link fencing on both sides of the tracks, 26-foot tall catenary supports every 30 feet, and 12-foot to 16-foot sound walls where proposed - would create a profound barrier and massive disturbance.</p> <p>The Pacheco Pass alignment would result in an estimated 10 minute reduction in travel time between Los Angeles and San Jose or San Francisco over the Altamont Pass alignment. This surely cannot be valid justification for the great environmental damage done to this area of the Diablo Range and the Grasslands and its environs. And, the Altamont Pass alignment would better serve and provide more options for intra-Bay Area transportation needs (an area well-known for its traffic jams), not to mention the obvious benefits to the Sacramento/Stockton/Tracey communities.</p> <p>When one looks at the travel needs and deficits of the State in a logical and economical manner, it appears that a blend of options would work best. According to the latest data, San Francisco Bay Area commuters are second only to Los Angeles commuters in time spent stuck in traffic. The HSRA needs to consider such options as improved air travel for the long distances between major metropolitan areas and high-speed rail within the metropolitan areas (San Francisco/San Jose/East Bay, Los Angeles/San Diego, and Sacramento/East Bay). Consolidation of transportation infrastructure that contains sprawl rather than inducing it has the potential to substantially benefit wildlife. Not only would this better focus transportation efforts where they are clearly needed the most, in addition it would eliminate costly and unnecessary expenses, move people off of the highway system, decrease wear and tear on the highway -- and thus operations and maintenance expenses, improve safety, and vastly reduce negative environmental and social impacts across the entire landscape of California.</p> <p>There is wide agreement among agencies, environmental groups, and train-rider associations that an Altamont Pass alignment would best minimize environmental impacts and maximize ridership potential. The Altamont Pass alignment would add additional transportation options along an existing disrupted and congested corridor and encourage population growth in already established areas. This is an area of rapid growth; the HSRA should focus their efforts on "densification" of existing cities,</p>	

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>rather than encouraging urban sprawl and damaging the character of small rural communities.</p> <p>Any Pacheco Pass alignment leaves open the possibility that a Los Banos/Gustine/Santa Nella area station may be added in the future - particularly with added political pressure. Much land in the Santa Nella, Los Banos, and the Highway 140 area is already being speculatively purchased and/or planned for development by developers. Obviously, the entire high-speed train process has been taken over by development interests. The original plan -- and obvious choice to best serve the residents of California -- was for an Altamont Pass alignment. This alignment was abandoned when the governing board was taken over by San Jose development interests. The thought of \$40 BILLION of public monies being directed by developers is ludicrous.</p> <p>Due to the importance of the resources of the Grasslands and the Pacheco Pass area of the Diablo Range, I strongly urge the HSRA to eliminate any Pacheco Pass alignments.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments.</p>	
W057-1	Brandon Farley / Transportation Planner / San Diego, CA	I support California High Speed Rail for the state a means to provide necessary and critical transportation infrastructure to meet future needs. To that end, I believe an efficient system should be developed, one that meets the needs of both Northern and Southern California.	Comment acknowledged.
W057-2	Brandon Farley / Transportation Planner / San Diego, CA	<p>Item #1</p> <p>Those in Southern California have not been provided equal opportunity to provide public comment in an open forum concerning a decision by the Authority to choose an alignment option and point of entry from the Central Valley into the Bay Area. Yet Southern Californians have as much to gain or lose by the choice that will be made by the Authority. Additional hearings should be conducted in Southern California.</p>	Comment acknowledged. The Authority and FRA disagree with this assessment. It was not necessary, desirable, or practicable to hold public hearings in southern California for this Program EIR/EIS process.
W057-3	Brandon Farley / Transportation Planner / San Diego, CA	<p>Item #2</p> <p>At stake for Southern Californians is level of direct service to the various legs that is contained in each option. The present adopted preferred alignment identifies two (2) terminals in Northern California; Sacramento and San Francisco. This means that every other train leaving Southern California for Northern California will be destined to either San Francisco or Sacramento, on average.</p> <p>Assuming the high speed rail system will have capacity limitations on the in the</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>system, such as the ability to process trains between Northern and Southern California, additional alignment legs or terminal locations means a further splitting of available capacity to where service must be sent.</p> <p>The Altamont alignment enters the Bay Area via a centrally located alignment, prompting several additional options as to where service must be sent once rails reach the San Francisco Bay basin. Should rails and service be sent south to San Jose, north to Oakland, or west and north to San Francisco? How about all three? These additional options, if they move forward, will mean that Southern Californians will have fewer train choices, fewer available daily trip departure times for direct - no transfer - trips to destinations along the different legs of the system. If the Altamont alignment is selected with San Jose and San Francisco being on separate legs and having terminals, and assuming a leg will be constructed to Sacramento, service from Southern California will be split among three (3) separate legs. Not two (2). And assuming a limitation on the ability to process trains, fewer trip departure times would be available for direct trips.</p> <p>-3The Pacheco alignment offers the best choice when considering direct service from Southern California to the Bay Area. The Pacheco alignment serves both San Jose and San Francisco on one leg.</p>	
W057-4	Brandon Farley / Transportation Planner / San Diego, CA	<p>Item #3</p> <p>The range of options examined each includes an examination of alignment and service between Merced and Tracy/Stockton. However, the Pacheco Alignment cuts west at Merced and does not travel to Tracy/Stockton. As identified in Table S-5.1, all Pacheco alignments listed are incorrectly weighed or evaluated when including this segment. Capital costs, operating cost, and environmental impacts are each unnecessarily higher and incorrectly magnified when consider the Pacheco alignment in an apples to apples comparison with the Altamont alignment.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. The Authority and FRA disagree with this assessment. The costs and impacts were appropriately weighed. The link between the Bay Area and Central Valley is part of the Authority's adopted statewide HST system. Each network alternative was evaluated on an "apples to apples" basis as a part of the Authority's adopted statewide HST system.</p>
W058-1	Mr. Donald Rothblatt / San Jose State University / Professor of Urban Planning / San Jose, CA	<p>Because it would link the proposed High-Speed Train directly to the two most populous and economically important cities in the Bay Area (San Jose and San Francisco), I strongly recommend that one of the Pacheco Pass Alignment Alternatives be selected as the best option for this project. No new Bay crossing would be needed, since Oakland and the East Bay communities would be connected</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		to the High-Speed Train with the existing AMTRACK service to San Jose.	
W059-1	Mr. Daniele Petrone / Cornell University / Transportation Planner / San Francisco, CA	I support the Altamont alignment, which will serve a much larger number of riders including commuters traveling from Tracy, Stockton, and Livermore into the Bay Area. The Pacheco alignment prevents any city in the Central Valley north of Merced from getting a station, and makes future extensions to Stockton and Sacramento much more difficult. Please, ignore petty claims from San Jose politicians and business leaders, and make the decision that is best for the state, environment and rail system as a whole. Thank you very much for your time.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W060-1	John Anderson / Burlingame, CA	A project this important, with so much promise, deserves a lot more publicity than it's getting in the general press. I only found out about the route proposals a few days ago. When I saw the map with the two proposed routes to the Bay Area, I thought reaching the Bay Area via Altamont made more sense than Pacheco Pass. Since travel between NCal and SCal is the objective, I saw that both San Francisco and East Bay riders will get to SCal quicker via Pacheco Pass. The only downside to that is, to a small degree, travel from the Bay Area to Stockton or Sacramento. However, the distance is not that great, so a fast train versus the service we have now won't really make much difference. Therefore, I conclude that Pacheco Pass will serve the public better, which will translate into greater ridership.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W061-1	Daniel Jacobson / Richmond, CA	HSR MUST CHOOSE THE ALTAMONT ALLIGNMENT! It will open HSR to a whole new demographic of riders: commuters from Modesto, Tracy, Livermore, etc. going to San Jose and San Francisco. How can HSR truly serve California if a few vocal South Bay advocates ensure that the Pacheco alignment is chosen, thereby eliminating HSR access for any city in the Central Valley north of Merced (coincidentally, the cities with the highest growth rates in Northern California and also those in the greatest need of smart growth and TOD). Altamont is without a doubt the best alignment for California.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W062-1	Mr. Steve Eittreim / geologist, retired / Palo Alto, CA	I am happy that the planning process is continuing for CA HST. My only concern is that the process is glacially slow in contrast to the high-speed growth of population and need for such a system. The revenue should be found for paying for this using higher taxes on cars. Higher gas taxes is the obvious source of funds and is the fairest as the need is created by the clogging of our already-overbuilt freeways by cars.	Comment acknowledged.
		I am impressed by the thoroughness of impact studies and would favor the Pacheco Pass route into the Central Valley.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
			Preferred Alternative.
W063-1	Mr. Scott Seekatz / Sacramento, CA	I want to first say that I support this HST project 100%. I have lived in various areas around this state from the Bay Area to LA/OC counties to now living in Sacramento. We live in a large state and it can take a lot of time and energy (gas) to get from one part of the state to the next. In order to relieve congestion and to lower the amount of CO2 released from cars traveling up and down the I-5 corridor we need to go ahead with this project and make it easier for Californians to do business, travel, and save the environment.	Comment acknowledged.
W063-2	Mr. Scott Seekatz / Sacramento, CA	I would also like to say that I also support bringing the HST over the Pacheco Pass from the central valley. The land in this area is already in holding for the government and will not require purchasing or setting aside land because it is already in partnership with the state. It will also be easier to create lanes for track going up 101 from Gilroy to hook up in San Jose because there is more available land then in the Livermore, Dublin area.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 f and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of or the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W063-3	Mr. Scott Seekatz / Sacramento, CA	Overall this is a great project which will help our state to thrive, provide more jobs, and cut down on congestion and pollution while allowing our citizens to sit back and enjoy the ride flying down the golden state in the HST.	Comment acknowledged.
W064-1	Stephanie / Harvard School of Public Health / Graduate Student, / San Leandro, CA	I totally agree that the transit needs for the bay area cannot be readily met without great adverse impact to our environment on road alone.	Comment acknowledged.
W064-2	Stephanie / Harvard School of Public Health / Graduate Student, / San Leandro, CA	as a state, I have long standing concerns about run off when the traffic is so heavy in I-5, which runs so precariously close to our the aqueduct system.	Comment acknowledged.
W064-3	Stephanie / Harvard School of Public Health / Graduate Student, / San Leandro, CA	I am in favor of implementing a high speed rail system not only for environmental reasons, but also for safety reasons. As a former university student in southern California with family in northern California, I made the trip from Oakland to LA and back several times a year in the past decade. I know how dangerous it can be first hand driving for hours on end, with lack of sleep, and without an additional passenger to keep company and help with driving. More cars off the roads means less pollution related to traffic, less noise, and less traffic related fatalities, which are all great advantages to high speed rail in California.	Comment acknowledged.
W065-1	Mr. Matt Lyon / Engineer / Milpitas, CA	I continue to support the Pacheco Pass alternative as the preferred HSR route. If this endeavor seeks to compete with the airlines and not BART/ACE then the Pacheco Pass clearly makes more sense. The Altamont Pass has to many engineering and	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		operational distractions to make it viable - IMHO.	and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W066-1	Ms. Margaret Petitjean / Homeowners Against Loud Trains / retired / Menlo Park, CA	There are thousands of elderly and others who cannot or will not fly or drive who would welcome high speed rail to take them to visit their loved ones.	Comment acknowledged.
W066-2	Ms. Margaret Petitjean / Homeowners Against Loud Trains / retired / Menlo Park, CA	Along the Caltrain Corridor there is a serious public health hazard from diesel locomotives of commuter and freight service which is ever-increasing with serious air and noise pollution and congestion at the numerous rail crossings without grade separations. This rules out transit oriented housing.	Comment acknowledged. The HST system would be completely grade-separated. The Caltrain Corridor was selected as the Preferred Alternative. Grade-separations on the Caltrain Corridor would improve air and noise pollution by eliminating the numerous rail crossings.
W066-3	Ms. Margaret Petitjean / Homeowners Against Loud Trains / retired / Menlo Park, CA	The Pacheco Pass route would: 1. Include Silicon Valley, 2. Ensure grade separation for emergency and other traffic 3. Lessen loss from earthquakes greater on Hayward and other faults. 4. Eliminate lethal blasting horns over a thousand times a day threatening life, property and the pursuit of happiness and freezing residents on and off the tracks as "deer in headlights".	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W067-1	Sam Killou / Tax Payer / Firefighter / Auberry, CA	The time is now! High speed rail is our future, for the economy and more important, the environment. I applaud all those who are working to make this happen. And for those who stand in the way....Why? This project should already be under construction, cut the red tape and let's move California ahead!	Comment acknowledged.
W068-1	Raymond Ahearn / National Assoc. of Railroad Passengers / Retired / Oakland, CA	<p>I have read the DEIR Summary and some of the detailed material comparing the environmental impacts of the 'Pacheco' and 'Altamont' alternative routings from the San Francisco Bay Area to the Central Valley and I have followed the public discussion of the negative and positive environmental impacts of these routings.</p> <p>While there are negative environmental impacts in both alternatives, I believe that those associated with the 'Pacheco' alternative are vastly more significant. The major potential for environmental damage of this routing is found in the very high potential for sprawl development pressures both in southern Santa Clara Valley and even more so on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley where the route emerges from the Coast Range. In addition, this routing forgoes the opportunity to serve the existing huge populations to be found along the Altamont routing in the Tri Valley area of Contra Costa County and in northern San Joaquin County.</p> <p>While there are negative impacts to routing through the heavily built-up areas such as Pleasanton, mitigations have been proposed (including some undergrounding) to</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		greatly reduce these. I therefore advocate adopting the Altamont routing, but including a side main line from Fremont area to San Jose.	
W069-1	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Dear Messrs. Morshed and Boardman: The California Department of Parks and Recreation (California State Parks) has evaluated the above-referenced Draft Program EIR/EIS. We appreciate the additional review time provided; however, due to the length of the document, the complexity of the issues, and the scope of California State Parks' concerns, more review time would have been appreciated.	This comment letter was also received in hard copy. Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-2	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	California State Parks is a State Agency as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) PRC § 21082.1, a Responsible Agency (PRC § 21069) and a Trustee Agency as used by CEQA, its guidelines, and as defined by CCR § 15386 for the resources affected by this project within units of the State Park System. Our mission is to provide for the health, inspiration, and education of the people of California by helping preserve the state's extraordinary biodiversity, protecting its most valued natural and cultural resources, and creating opportunities for high quality outdoor recreation. The 1.4 million-acre California State Park System, for which we are responsible, is currently made up of 278 classified units and several major unclassified properties.	Comment acknowledged.
W069-3	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Notice of Preparation comments submitted by California State Parks in December 2005 expressed concern that the mountain crossing between the Bay Area and Central Valley will result in irreversible damage to natural, cultural and scenic resources of the State park System. Although the alternative route through Henry W. Coe State Park has now been dropped from consideration, the Pacheco Pass option still poses potential significant environmental consequences to Pacheco State Park, San Luis Reservoir State Recreation Area, George J. Hatfield State Recreation Area, Great Valley Grasslands SP and the Martial Cottle property. In addition, it is unclear whether the proposed Pacheco Pass alignment would affect the current Bell Station entrance to Henry W. Coe State Park. The Bell Station entrance to the new Dowdy Ranch park facilities was opened to the public in the spring of 2007. California State Parks wants to ensure that access from State Highway 152 remains available.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-4	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and	Although the Bay Area-Central Valley connection is no longer proposed to cut through Henry W. Coe SP, the Pacheco Pass route still has the potential for significant impacts to parks and the character and landscape of the southern Diablo Range.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
	Recreation / Sacramento, CA		
W069-5	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Issues raised by California State Parks at the Notice of Preparation stage in 2005 have not been satisfactorily addressed in this new draft document. The document fails to address impacts to landscape-level features, as well as to specific sensitive and special-status resources. Lack of this type of broad analysis hampers evaluation of the potential impacts and comparison of impacts associated with the proposed alignment options.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-6	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Since the circulation of the NOP for the project, climate change has risen as an issue of extreme importance and priority for this administration, and for California State Parks as well. The Authority should include a serious discussion not only of how climate change considerations play in to the proposed project; but also, how climate change issues can add urgency to natural resource management decisions and strategies.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-7	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Preferred Alternative California State Parks strongly recommends that the Altamont Pass route be adopted over the Pacheco Pass route. The Altamont route passes through an already developed and fragmented area. It would provide significantly greater benefits for Bay Area commuters. The Pacheco area, including a landscape reserve of statewide importance and state park land, is in much better condition and is seriously threatened by the project. Although the draft EIR/EIS does not put forward a preferred alternative route for the Bay Area-Central Valley segment of the High Speed Train, and although the analysis in the document is really insufficient to compare many, if not most environmental aspects, California State Parks clearly foresees less environmental impact to park and area reserve resources and less new impact to regional land use with the Altamont Pass crossing, which uses the Union Pacific Rail Road alignment. This route would avoid all State Park System units and would make the most use of existing transportation rights of way and corridors, and serve far more numerous urban areas.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-8	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	The document does not analyze in any meaningful way the impacts of the Pacheco Pass route on the Mt. Hamilton landscape reserve between the Morgan Hill area and the Central Valley. The following comments refer to this reserve, but all statements equally apply to Henry W. Coe State Park. The result of fragmentation on habitat communities and animal populations apply equally to Coe, the core area of the Mt. Hamilton reserve, as they do to the overall reserve itself. This area is one of the	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>most significant and strategic landscape reserves preserving biological diversity in California. The State (California Department of Parks and Recreation and Fish and Game) and The Nature Conservancy have committed vast resources in establishing this near-complete reserve. It makes little sense to run new transportation infrastructure through this relatively pristine and protected area in light of a more feasible alternative, Altamont Pass route that has a major developed transportation corridor as well as many other intensively developed urban areas. Figure 2.5-2 clearly depicts most of the protected areas making up this reserve. On the same figure, compare this area to the Altamont Pass open space area, which has very little landscape protection. In addition this open space area of the Altamont route is cut by a regional freeway creating a huge barrier to wildlife movement, which, lacking sustainability, will result in significant species lost.</p>	
W069-9	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>Much more effort needs to go into the Pacheco Pass route in order to assess its impacts to habitat and wildlife in the coming years. The rail will potentially do great harm to the viability and even existence of many habitat communities and animal populations. It will fragment the reserve area from habitat and animal populations to the south. This fragmentation needs to be assessed to determine the potential serious threat to biological diversity to the reserve and its core areas. Along with animal populations, plant communities need to be assessed since up to 50 % of plant recruitment can be from seed dispersed by animals. This assessment should include review of species/area relationships and analysis of impact and potential future extinctions. It has been shown by Wilson and MacArthur that up to 50 % of species can be lost when certain fragmentation occurs due to factors resulting in reducing area size below what is needed to assure sustainability.</p>	<p>Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.</p>
W069-10	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>The document references the Missing Links information related to statewide wildlife connectivity, suggesting that fragmentation may not be an issue since this information did not highlight connectivity needs in the Mt. Hamilton area. This conclusion is false. The reason connectivity was not identified was because no one from the area was in attendance at the San Diego forum. Many other areas in the state were not included for this reason. Clearly, connectivity within and adjacent to a reserve area of statewide significance is a very important issue that needs to be thoroughly analyzed.</p>	<p>Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.</p>
W069-11	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and</p>	<p>The importance of the Mt. Hamilton area in relationship to the Altamont Pass area should be assessed in light of global warming. It is well recognized by most land use managers and research biologists that most species, e.g. valley and blue oak, will re-establish north of existing locations. A primary objective to protect plant and animal species from extinction from climate change will be facilitating northerly movement.</p>	<p>Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
	Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Reserve planning is focusing seriously on north-south connectors. The Pacheco Pass route could seriously harm, or eliminate, northerly movement. Research is estimating by the end of the century 15-35 % of plant and animal species will be lost as a result of climate change. This subject needs serious researcher and analysis before any alternative can be selected.	
W069-12	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	The steep terrain associated with and above each tunnel should generally be considered as linkages from south of the Pacheco Pass route to the Mt. Hamilton area. While these areas may not be fenced and developed, they represent the most difficult areas for wildlife passage.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-13	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Pertinent Documents The Pacheco SP General Plan was approved in May 2006. It should be referenced in the DEIR and is available on-line at: http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=22694 . The second Highway 152 crossing may pose conflicts with DPR's anticipated safety changes for the Dinosaur Point Rd.-Highway 152 intersection. The San Luis Reservoir SRA was approved in 1986 and is available on-line: http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=24363 . An amendment to the general plan is currently in progress. The DEIR/EIS should reflect the existing DPR general plan and incorporate anticipated changes with respect to park ownership, park resources, and public use.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-14	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Wildlife Migratory Corridors/Habitat Fragmentation The Pacheco Pass alternative may potentially exacerbate habitat fragmentation depending upon decisions for a dedicated right of-way and provision for wildlife crossings. Construction impact problems also exist. This alignment also has potential to adversely impact the San Luis Reservoir State Recreation Area/Pacheco State Park complex of recreation lands to the east. Mitigation and subsequent analysis should be performed for this alternative.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-15	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Mitigation proposed for impacts to all State Park System Units by these or other alternative route corridors, must replace the full biological productivity and recreational opportunity, both in kind and in area.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W069-16	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	The maps should show current migratory routes and should be reviewed by the USFWS and DFG. Large under crossings and other appropriate provisions will need to accommodate migration of mammals. How will the new rail bed be protected from burrowing by ground squirrels? Experience has shown that new construction can attract ground squirrels, which in turn can attract raptors in an unnatural way, leading to increased mortality of predatory raptor species.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Will HST train alignment also result in additional utility easements for power poles, underground gas lines, fiber optic lines? If so, power poles and overhead structures may act as perch sites for raptors and result in increased kill rates of raptor food sources.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-17	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Noise The document does not adequately address the effects of project-related noise from construction and operation on the natural environment, animal species, and recreationists seeking solitude and ambient quiet.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-18	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Introduction of Exotic Plant Species The document does not adequately address the potential role of the project as a conduit for invasive plant species. With construction and operation of the facilities, highly invasive noxious plant species can be introduced in previously native plant dominated areas. Preventing infestations of exotic plant species is key to maintaining high quality native vegetation communities and natural habitats.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-19	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Affected Environment The draft program EIR/EIS fails to adequately describe the affected environment. Instead, lists and tables attempt to portray the resources present, without evaluation and analysis. Numbers of special status plant and animal species, acres of wetlands, linear feet of streams, presence/absence of marine and anadromous fish resources and names of active faults crossed are listed in tables, by alignment segments; however, these measures fail to take into account context, importance, qualitative values and functional relationships. For example, if an alignment runs along an active fault segment, it may only cross the fault one time, if at all, and would be assigned a lower seismic hazard rating than an alignment that crosses many faults. However, the multiple fault crossings could produce less damage in a seismic event than the single fault crossing, when the	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		alignment actually follows the fault trace.	
W069-20	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Another example of tables of numbers and lists mis-representing the affected environment would be Table 3.15-1 "Biological Resources Summary Data Table for Alignments and Station Location Option Comparisons." Corridors and alignment alternatives are reduced to numbers of special status species. This fails to recognize the importance of functioning ecosystems, intact habitats, and the inter-relationships of habitats and vegetation communities. Special status species such as the San Joaquin kit fox rely on grasslands and mixed shrub/grassland habitats throughout low, rolling hills and in the San Joaquin Valley, and on soils suitable for den construction. These requirements are key to the species' survival and are not evaluated in the draft program EIR/EIS.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-21	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	The document lacks a clear comparison and analysis of impacts associated with the alternative routes. The multiple tables with multiple route segments and multiple options make actual impact comparisons impossible to complete.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-22	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	The maps should show all State Park System units in the vicinity, not just Henry W. Coe SP. Pacheco, Caswell Memorial and Great Valley Grasslands SPs; San Luis Reservoir, George J. Hatfield, Lake del Valle, and McConnell SRAs and Carnegie SVRA and the Martial Cottle Ranch property should also be portrayed. In addition, other conservation lands should be displayed throughout, such as regional parks, conservancy lands, and federal and state wildlife reserves.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-23	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	The Altamont route uses more existing transportation rights-of-way; and therefore has less new impact to aesthetics and land-use.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-24	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Sec. 4(f) and Sec. 6(f) Impacts The document states that the tunnel for the Pacheco Pass alternative would not have any impacts to Sec. 4(f) or 6 (f) resources (page 3.16-11 F, San Jose to Central Valley Corridor). However, the appendices show multiple tunnels and at-grade segments. Significant cuts and fills would alter the landscape and affect runoff patterns, erosion of soils, and surface habitats. There would undoubtedly be construction impacts to surface water flows, groundwater, and aesthetics from	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>Highway 152 and 33, to geological resources (rock outcrops and geologic structures) and paleontological resources from the tunnels and rail facilities. The document must acknowledge the Sec. 4(f) and Sec. 6(f) impacts and make the case</p> <p>1: There is no feasible and prudent alternative to impacting park resources, and</p> <p>2: All possible planning to minimize impact to parklands has been conducted.</p>	
W069-25	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>Pacheco State Park</p> <p>The proposed HST alignment passes near the park's boundaries near State Route 152 and California Department of Fish and Game's Upper and the Lower Cottonwood Wildlife Areas and includes extensive tunneling. The topography in the immediate area consists of steep hills that restrict vistas to canyons and adjacent slopes and ridges. Broad vistas in the area are only available from ridge tops. The Pacheco State Park General Plan speaks to the importance of the park as a remnant of the historic California landscape. The HST project could intrude on the perception of old, rural California. This factor should have been addressed in the Bay Area-Central Valley program EIR/EIS. Major impacts will occur during construction and operation. Dislocations to park operations during construction should be described and if necessary mitigated in the subsequent detailed EIR. At-grade segments of this alignment in the proposed corridor will impact wildlife corridors, wildlife habitat, viewshed, and increase existing noise levels. A better alternative would be to de-select the Pacheco Pass route altogether, thereby sparing the open space recreation resources in the Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass environs.</p>	<p>Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.</p>
W069-26	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>San Luis Reservoir State Recreation Area</p> <p>The HST alignment at this park would skirt the State Recreation Area's San Luis Creek area, cross the park's connection to the California aqueduct bikeway and an existing campground in proximity to the California Department of Fish and Game's O'Neill Forebay Wildlife Area. It would also pass through the California Department of Fish and Game's Upper Cottonwood Creek Wildlife Area and bisects The Nature Conservancy's Romero Ranch conservation easement area. Those agencies have joined their management efforts through the park's general plan process currently in place.</p> <p>The San Luis Reservoir State Recreation Area general plan process does not address the HST proposal. It is instead focused on natural values of the resource and the recreation activities that can be supported without harming those resources. If the HST were routed along this corridor option, those resources would be threatened. Route construction and the eventual disturbances by passing trains would diminish</p>	<p>Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>the core wildlife, such as the kit fox, due to habitat fragmentation and dedicated right-of-way closing wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Recreation values of the adjoining lands would also be diminished. For instance, impacts to an area just across the bay from the current campground, where there is potential for additional day-use and camping, may be pre-empted by this proposal as eventual road service to this area may be eliminated by the HST. Construction activity, noise, dust and impairment of scenic vistas would lessen the sense of openness that currently pervades the park. If construction or an operating corridor would adversely impact visitation or campground use, in-kind mitigation and restoration of lost revenue should be required.</p>	
W069-27	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>McConnell State Recreation Area</p> <p>This recreation area lies in a triangle created by three possible alignments as the HST route moves between the Bay Area and Fresno, Sacramento and Fresno, and Sacramento and the Bay Area. Depending on alignment selection, passing trains could interfere with nearly 2.5 miles of the recreational boating experience associated with the park. De-selection of the Diablo Range crossings and UPRR routes would eliminate the most troublesome alignments. Sound walls might mitigate noise aspects, but there would remain potential visual impact to recreation use as the tracks cross the river. Besides addressing these possible impacts and providing appropriate mitigation, construction and operation may cause a loss of public access resulting in decreased visitation and revenue. Alternative access and revenue restoration are possible mitigations.</p>	<p>Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.</p>
W069-28	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>Great Valley Grasslands SP</p> <p>The park preserves one of few intact examples of native grasslands on the floor of the Central Valley. The park is part of the larger Grasslands Ecological Area (GEA) of federal, state and private lands all managed for wildlife values. The GEA represents the largest remaining contiguous block of wetlands in California. Several rare and endangered plant and animal species inhabit the park, including alkali sacaton, a native bunch grass, and the Delta button celery (<i>Erynum racemosum</i>) a state listed endangered species found in the flood plain of the San Joaquin River. Biologists have also reported the California Tiger Salamander and endangered vernal pool fairy shrimp and tadpole shrimp. Springtime wildflower displays, fishing and wildlife watching attract visitors to this undeveloped park, which also encompasses the former Fremont Ford State Recreation Area.</p>	<p>Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W069-29	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	<p>Martial Cottle Property</p> <p>This is a new site for which public access will be allowed in the future. It is a 290-acre ranch in the midst of a built-up urban area. In October 2003, California State Parks and the County of Santa Clara entered into a joint powers agreement to enable a donation and sale offer of land in San Jose from Walter Lester. Under the terms of the agreement, Mr. Lester's family farm will be preserved as an historic agricultural park, providing open space, recreation and interpretation benefits for future generations. The County has assumed responsibility for establishing a master plan to guide future development, financing, and constructing the improvements as well as maintenance and operations. Facilities and activities will be designed to educate people about the important role of agriculture in Santa Clara County history.</p>	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-30	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	<p>Geology and Soils</p> <p>The slope stability analysis does not consider steepness, debris flow potential, geomorphologic mapping, drainage courses, and run-out areas. Areas where the alignment crosses the Coast Ranges are especially subject to landslide hazards and are characterized by debris flows, debris slides, and creep, especially in the mélange units of the Franciscan Complex. The best mitigation for slope stability and landslide issues is avoidance of the hazard. Although avoidance is not always an option, it should always be the first option considered, since its effectiveness is superior to engineered slope treatments and foundation excavations.</p> <p>Cut and fill operations could result in fill slope and cut slope failures. These areas need to be evaluated, according to their physical properties, such as dip slope, fractures, bedding inclination, joints, etc. Where cuts and fills are constructed, the width of the "affected environment" should be extended to include the full extent of surface disruption.</p>	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-31	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	<p>Impacts of tunnel construction associated with all HST alternatives need to be further evaluated. The blasting, drilling, and hydrological disruption will have impacts in all segments using new tunnels. Tunnels can interrupt groundwater movement, limiting horizontal flow, as well as capturing flow, thereby "robbing" adjacent areas of water. In areas of fracture permeability (Diablo Range, for example) this impact is most critical. In addition, the influence tunnel construction (blasting and excavation) could have on spring behavior is unknown. These fragile and sometimes ephemeral water resources provide invaluable habitat for aquatic plants and animals. In areas of fracture permeability, spring productivity can be very tenuous, and external influences can produce significant adverse impacts.</p>	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W069-32	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Details Fig. S 4-1: should show all significant parklands, not just Henry W. Coe State Park.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-33	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Fig. 1.2-4: The two bar charts are not adequately labeled. It is unclear to which of the bar charts the title "Percentage of Arrivals Delayed -1999" refers. Although two bar charts are displayed in this figure, the difference between the two is not made clear; the horizontal and vertical axes are identically labeled.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-34	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Fig. 2.5-1: This map should show all park and conservation lands of the region, not just Henry W. Coe State Park (Pacheco SP, San Luis Reservoir SRA, Great Valley Grasslands SP, Carnegie SVRA, Lake Del Valle SRA, DFG, TNC, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service managed and regional park lands).	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-35	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Fig. 2.5-7 SJ-CV: This map should include portrayal of park and conservation lands (see comment immediately above).	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-36	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Fig. 2.5-8: This map should include the locations of Carnegie SVRA and Lake Del Valle SRA, as well as regional parks and conservation lands.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-37	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3.9-4 SJ-CV: last paragraph: Include Pacheco State Park in the list of areas where the line would be visible, producing a medium to high visual impact.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W069-38	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3.9-20: Visual and Aesthetics. California State Parks has a concern about the effects of cuts and fills to Pacheco Creek. The document does not address disposal methods for excavated soils and rock associated with the at-grade cut and fill sections of the route nor disposal options for the tunnel spoils.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-39	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3.12-5: Paleontological Resources. Simplistic descriptions are used and will result in skewed analysis. Only 2 choices of sensitivity: High-vertebrates, rare, significant and Low: No or very low densities (same as unknown). This is a flawed methodology that will result in skewed results: Paleontological resources should be considered of high value if found, even if a low probability of discovery exists. Mammoth remains have been documented in San Luis Reservoir SRA, and additional important vertebrate fossils could be discovered in the construction process.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-40	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3.12-20: Inconsistent discussion of sensitivities and paleontological resources potential.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-41	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3.12-28 and 3.12-29: C. Paleontological Resources: The draft document states that sufficient information is not available at the program level to assess impacts and assure that mitigation strategies will reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. The document infers that additional environmental assessment will allow more precise evaluation in "project-level environmental analysis" and concludes that potential impacts to cultural and historic resources are considered significant at the program level even with the application of mitigation strategies. Note that this reference to impacts to cultural and historic resources is included in the Paleontological Resources section (C). For this section, "cultural and historic resources" should be deleted and replaced with "paleontological resources". Because the document lacks comparative information for paleontological resources at the program level, it is not possible to evaluate and compare the paleontological resource effects from the various alternative alignments.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-42	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and	Even so, the proposed mitigation measures are not adequate to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Avoiding impact to irreplaceable, one-of-a-kind fossil resources is superior to educating workers, recovery of fossils, construction site monitoring, and curation in accredited research facilities.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
	Recreation / Sacramento, CA		
W069-43	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3-12-30: Preparation of a paleontological resources treatment plan at the project level EIR/EIS does not constitute mitigation.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-44	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3.13-3: Seismic hazards evaluation. Why is there no medium hazard for the stations? (This methodology may yield skewed results for potential impacts, similar to the paleontological resources methodology.)	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-45	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3.13-21: Spelling error, paragraph heading A: Seismic, not Siesmic.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-46	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3.14-29: Spelling error: San Luis Creek and San Luis waterway (not Louis)	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-47	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	p. 3.16-11 F. Pacheco Alignment Alternative: Conclusion is not founded; "tunnel would not have any impacts to Sec. 4(f) or 6(f) resources". On the contrary, tunneling and cut and fill construction activities may present significant impacts to Pacheco SP and San Luis Reservoir SRA. The impact to park resources needs to be revealed, assessed, and avoided if at all possible. According to the strip maps and cross sections in the appendices, there will be a series of tunnels, cut and fill slopes, and at-grade segments. The tracks would cross State Route 152 twice (station 54 +893 and 63+ ~600, Appendix page 2-D-31.)	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-48	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources	Appendices Appendix 2-D is illegible in paper copy. On-line review at 200% provided better	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
	Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	resolution; however this is a very awkward way to determine proposed project effects. The strip maps are of no value for evaluating impacts. The maps should show topography, hydrology, adjacent land-use, and watershed configuration. The segmented nature of the maps hampers analysis and determination of context and big picture issues. To facilitate meaningful review of impacts, maps should be developed to show shaded relief, hydrology, adjacent land-use and conservation land property boundaries.	
W069-49	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	There is no obvious discussion of tunnel spoil disposal alternatives in the document.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-50	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	2-D 30 and 31: Pacheco Pass alignment. Impacts State Parks: Pacheco SP and San Luis Reservoir SRA. Tunnels near Pacheco SP and through San Luis Reservoir SRA will have construction related impacts, such as spoil disposal, difficult drilling/tunnel boring, water effects (shortage of water for drilling purposes, and interference with ground water hydrology). Effects of tunnels on natural springs and local water supplies for native plant and animal species should be described.	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-51	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Summary List of Species Potentially Affected by Pacheco Pass Alternative The attached list by park units summarizes species that may be impacted by the Pacheco Pass alignment, and which need to be evaluated. In addition, general concerns are listed. Please use this attached list and address project impacts to the species listed in all environmental documents for the proposed project	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-52	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	Mitigation In the event that HST alignments through or in proximity to units of the State Park System are selected, California State Parks recommends consideration of the following mitigations, in addition to those referenced elsewhere in this letter, for natural, cultural, aesthetic and recreational impacts. Subsequent specific environmental documents, and/or more specific project proposals may result in additional or more specific recommendations. Mitigation for impacts to units of the California State Park System include but are not	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>being limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide monetary compensation to the California Department of Parks and Recreation (and concessionaire if applicable) for revenues lost during construction due to closure or disruption of California State Park System units. 2. Provide monetary compensation to the California Department of Parks and Recreation on behalf of the people of the State of California for lost park and recreation use. (People of the State of Ca., et al. v. BP America Inc. et al. U.S. Dist. Ct., Central District of CA. No. 92-0837 R) 3. If necessary, due to closure during construction, provide alternative shuttle access service to park visitors. 4. For any loss of facilities, fund the California Department of Parks and Recreation for restoration to a natural state of the existing facility sites prior to project commencement. 5. Fund siting and planning studies as well as provide design and full development costs of facility replacement prior to project commencement. 6. In the event that impacts to a unit of the State Park System reduce the unit to less than park value, acquire for dedication to and with the approval of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, park sites of equivalent biological productivity, recreational opportunity, both in kind and in area, within the region of loss, and which are in the opinion of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, of sufficient potential to replace the natural, cultural, aesthetic and recreational values prior to project commencement. 7. Provide funding for the California Department of Parks and Recreation's preparation of Resource Inventory, General Plan, and Management Plan documents for all replacement sites. 8. Provide full reimbursement for all necessary plans, permits, and associated the California Department of Parks and Recreation staff time on all replacement sites. 9. Provide full market value for real property loss, including lease lands, prior to project commencement. 10. All construction equipment used within a ten-mile radius of units of the California State Park System will require a vehicle cleaning station (to wash undercarriages etc.) to assure protection against exotic plants from out of the area, and tarps under heavy equipment to catch grease/oil. 11. Provide, following any soil disturbance, revegetation with local native plants and 	

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>a plan for ongoing control of exotics and maintenance.</p> <p>12. In order to protect wetland resources, require best management practices to reduce erosion during construction, including sedimentation basins and their annual maintenance for the life of the development.</p> <p>15. Redesign and construct cuts, fills, and aerial structures to reduce their visual impact to units of the State Park System.</p> <p>16. To partially mitigate for loss of wildlife corridors and habitat fragmentation, provide, following consultation with and with the approval of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, dedicated conservation corridors between appropriate units of the State Park System and other protected public and private conservation lands prior to construction.</p> <p>17. Following identification of wildlife corridors, strategically placed wildlife under-or over-crossings should be constructed of sufficient utility to provide ready use by wildlife.</p> <p>18. Light control, shading, and daylight-hours only operations should be required as necessary, in prior agreement with the California Department of Parks and Recreation, to protect critical wildlife corridors, visitor use areas, and as safety requires.</p>	
W069-53	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>Pacheco Pass versus Altamont Crossing</p> <p>As previously described, the draft document does not provide adequate comparisons of impacts associated with the various route alternatives. Despite this lack, the document proposes to put forward a preferred alternative following receipt of public comment on the draft document. How this preferred alternative would be selected is not fully described. This presents a difficult and troublesome situation for California State Parks, because this is a critical time to provide momentum to the environmentally superior alternative, which has not been identified in the draft document. Absent additional documentation, the Altamont Pass route clearly offers environmental advantages over the many park and natural resource impacts associated with the Pacheco Pass route. The potential impacts of the Pacheco Pass route to park and reserve resources are significant. This area is one of the most significant and strategic landscape reserves preserving biological diversity in California.</p>	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-54	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources</p>	<p>The State (California Department of Parks and Recreation and the Department of Fish and Game) and The Nature Conservancy have committed large amounts of resources in establishing this near-complete reserve. It makes little sense to run</p>	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
	Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	new transportation infrastructure through this relatively pristine and protected area in light of a more feasible, less environmentally-damaging alternative, the Altamont Pass route, which already has a major developed transportation corridor. For this reason, California State Parks recommends that the Altamont Pass route be put forward as the preferred alternative for future Bay Area-Central Valley environmental documents.	
W069-55	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIR/EIS. California State Parks encourages the Authority and FRA to avoid direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to all units of the State park System. Please coordinate and consult with our department throughout the project environmental review and project development process. As more information details become available with respect to alignments and construction methodologies, please work to inform us, especially if the developing details result in changes in anticipated alignments and impacts.</p> <p>If you require additional clarifications on our comments, please contact Ms. Syd Brown at 916-653-9930, sbrow@parks.ca.gov or me at 916-653-6725 or rrayb@parks.ca.gov.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Original Signed By Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division</p> <p>cc: Ruth Coleman, Director Ted Jackson, Deputy Director, Park Operations Don Monahan, State Park Superintendent V, Diablo Vista District Matt Fuzie, State Park Superintendent V, Monterey District Scott Wassmund, State Park Superintendent V, Central Valley District Rick Le Flore, State Park Superintendent IV, OHMVR Division Kathryn Tobias, Staff Counsel III, Legal Office Lynn Rhodes, Chief, Northern Field Division Tony Perez, Chief, Southern Field Division</p>	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.
W069-56	Mr. Richard Rayburn Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA	<p>Attachment: List of sensitive species for parks potentially impacted by HST Pacheco Pass alignment</p> <p>Sensitive Species & Issues for Parks Potentially Impacted by HST Project This list by park unit should be used to evaluate potential effects of the California High Speed Rail project.</p>	Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>Pacheco SP</p> <p>California red-legged frog</p> <p>San Joaquin kit fox</p> <p>Golden eagle</p> <p>Badger</p> <p>Impact of tunneling on springs and ponds Access to Pacheco SP off Hwy 152</p> <p>San Luis Reservoir SRA</p> <p>San Joaquin kit fox</p> <p>California Tiger Salamander</p> <p>Bald eagle</p> <p>Golden eagle</p> <p>Swainson's hawk</p> <p>Tri-colored blackbirds</p> <p>Tule elk</p> <p>Access to the park off Hwy 152 and Hwy 33</p> <p>Great Valley Grasslands SP</p> <p>California tiger salamander</p> <p>Vernal pool fairy shrimp</p> <p>Vernal pool tadpole shrimp</p> <p>Swainson's hawk</p> <p>Eryngium racemosum (delta button-celery) Atriplex miniscula (lesser saltbush)</p> <p>Astragalus tener var. tener (alkali milkvetch)</p> <p>McConnell and George J. Hatfield SRAs</p> <p>Swainson's hawk</p> <p>Valley elderberry longhorn beetle</p>	

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>Caswell Memorial SP</p> <p>Riparian brush rabbit</p> <p>Riparian woodrat</p> <p>Swainson's hawk</p> <p>Valley elderberry longhorn beetle</p> <p>Old growth riparian oak forest</p>	
W069-57	<p>Mr. Richard Rayburn</p> <p>Chief, Natural Resources Division / California Department of Parks and Recreation / Sacramento, CA</p>	<p>General concerns</p> <p>Noise and vibrations from large number of trains traversing the area Aesthetic impacts to park visitors; views from park properties impacted by new rail line, overhead structures, cuts and fills.</p>	<p>Please refer to Responses to Comment Letter S009.</p>
W070-1	<p>Mr. Mateo Burtch / Writer / San Francisco, CA</p>	<p>Hi. I'm writing to express my strong support for High-Speed Rail in general, and for the Altamont alignment for the Bay Area-to-Los Angeles corridor.</p> <p>Thank you. Mateo Burtch</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>
W071-1	<p>Charlie Cho / San Jose, CA</p>	<p>As a San Jose resident interested in a healthy regional rail system instead of vain local pride and Los Banos sprawl, I strongly support the Altamont route. It will bring better service (via BART) to the East Bay, a major population center. It is only logical to place the HSR line where there is heavy development (I-580) instead of a relatively pristine area (SR-152). This desire to have San Jose on the main trunk line is selfish, yet misguided. From a purely selfish San Jose standpoint, I would rather have separate San Jose-LA trains than board a SF-LA train in which all of the good seats have been taken by people from SF or the peninsula. I would rather San Jose be its own final destination rather than one of those stops on the way to San Francisco. I would rather not have express trains zooming down Monterey Boulevard, 125mph on an elevated structure. So I'm not sure why the San Jose establishment is so pro-Pacheco, unless their insecurity leads them to believe than San Jose won't get many trains with the Altamont route.</p> <p>Two factors heavily favor Altamont: the political desire to connect Sacramento ASAP (and the extremely fast SF/SJ-Sac running times), and the financial need that the newly built infrastructure hosts regional/commuter service in addition to long distance trains. A prime example of the latter is the Channel Tunnel Rail Line in southern England, which will greatly enhance commuter service in addition to</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please note there will be no HST station in the Los Banos area.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		speeding up the trip to Paris. Given than CHSRA isn't swimming in money, carrying the Pacheco alignment forward is a waste of time and money. If Los Banos real estate interests want Pacheco so badly, let them fund and build it and convince the HSR operator to run trains over it.	
W071-2	Charlie Cho / San Jose, CA	I am also disappointed by the specific alignments studied for the Altamont route approaching San Jose. Both the UPRR and I-880 alignments just miss San Jose Airport, unlike the Caltrain Metro East alignment developed by Michael Kiesling. (http://www.bayrailalliance.org/caltrain_metro_east_maps) I believe than serving San Jose Airport may increase the appeal of the Altamont route among certain San Jose interests. Since the FAA is currently looking to hand out money to study Bay Area airport access, perhaps CHSRA could obtain some in order to study the Caltrain Metro East alignment in a supplemental DEIR.	Please refer to Chapter 2, "Alternatives." A station site to connect with San Jose Airport was considered but rejected.
W071-3	Charlie Cho / San Jose, CA	I also believe that your Altamont route study greatly overstates the new infrastructure required north of and at San Jose Diridon Station. Separate elevated tracks and a second track/platform level at Diridon may not be necessary. Caltrain plans to make 3 tracks north of Diridon HSR compatible, and there is room at Diridon for additional platforms at ground level as well as tail tracks. Richard Mlynarik has modeled a future Caltrain/Altamont HSR schedule and the infrastructure required; the DEIR's track amplifications and aerial platforms are not needed, nor are new tunnels under the I-280 extension in San Francisco. http://www.sonic.net/~mly/Caltrain-Timetabling/Hillsdale-200704/Hillsdale.html	Please see Response to Comment I030-6. The Authority coordinated with the City of San Jose, SamTrans, and MTC's regional rail planning in regards to the configuration at San Jose Diridon Station, and with SamTrans and MTC's regional rail planning in regards to the Caltrain alignment assumptions.
W071-4	Charlie Cho / San Jose, CA	Hopefully the CHSRA is realizing that people, especially in the East Bay and Central Valley, are waking up to the fraud which is the Pacheco route and will see through the bait-and-switch of carrying both alternatives forward AGAIN. They will wonder why CHSRA is unrealistically and foolishly trying to build two routes to the Bay Area, including one superfluous route. People inclined to support HSR will wonder if CHSRA is competent at all; people against HSR will gleefully accuse the CHSRA of gold plating the system. All this erodes support for the bond measure, putting the entire system at risk. The importance of High Speed Rail in California is hard to overstate, and CHSRA must not allow San Jose/Los Banos interests to hurt its viability.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W072-1	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	[Please note--we have submitted our letter via email, with US Mail hard copy for reproduction. The version below does not hold its formatting, and is intended for use solely as backup in case of delivery problems with either of the other versions.] Dear Chairman Kopp: The Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund (TRANSDEF) is a Bay Area	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		environmental organization advocating the regional planning of transportation, land use and air quality. We are especially focused these days on policies that are responsive to the challenge of climate change. We strongly support High Speed Rail (HSR) and see it as likely to become the State's most far-reaching (literally as well as figuratively) climate change mitigation project.	
W072-2	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	The long list of capital projects that need to be built to provide a low-carbon way of life places tremendous pressure on your Authority to economize with this project. Cost-effectiveness in achieving an integrated California High Speed and intercity rail system will be key. That is why the "hybrid" recommendation that MTC adopted yesterday is a total non-starter. Because of its \$5 billion dollars of additional cost, we urge you to discard it from further review as an option, due to its financial infeasibility.	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.
W072-3	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	TRANSDEF finds this environmental document profoundly unsatisfactory. Major new work will be necessary to make the Bay Area to Central Valley Draft Program Environmental Impact Report/Statement (DPEIR/S) a valid basis for the important decision of selecting an HSR alignment to connect the Bay Area with the rest of California.	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.
W072-4	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	It is nothing short of inconceivable that an environmental document whose sole purpose is to inform the choice between two competing alignments is silent on the issue of the relative merits of those alignments. In its present form, the DPEIR/S offer no guidance on this weighty question, and doesn't offer even a summary table of benefits and impacts of the two alignments. Hundreds of pages go by without this issue being addressed. Did the EIR preparers think we would be so overwhelmed by the data as to miss this glaring absence? This flaw is so profound as to require revision and recirculation, without ever getting to the substance of our comments.	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.
W072-5	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	<p>Comprehensive Rail Network</p> <p>The capacity of HST facilities is so great that their unused capacity can be used to provide regional and interregional mobility solutions without building additional infrastructure. The Altamont alignment offers the opportunity to provide quality service to three travel markets (Bay Area to L.A., Bay Area to Sacramento, and Bay Area to Central Valley), where the Pacheco alignment only can serve one well. Piggybacking additional services on the same infrastructure enables dramatic capital cost savings.</p>	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W072-6	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	Building an HST line over the Altamont pass will cover most of the capital cost of providing fast, reliable ACE regional and interregional service. If the DPEIR/S cumulative impact analysis were to assume that ACE's future expansion funds were used to purchase rolling stock and operations, ACE would then be able to provide top notch service to Silicon Valley. This in turn would catalyze transit-oriented development in the Central Valley and in Silicon Valley that might otherwise not occur. The cumulative impacts analysis of such a scenario would note the difference between these results and the sprawl development that would occur in Santa Clara, Merced and San Benito Counties if the Pacheco alignment were built-out.	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.
W072-7	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	The operating plan assumptions used in the DPEIR/S were silly. The Base Case for the Altamont alignment assumes that only a fraction of the trains from southern California would connect with San Francisco, with the rest going to San Jose. DPEIR/S at S-12. The model then produces a lower ridership estimate for the Altamont alignment, because travel demand models project less ridership when less train service is available. That assumption is the product of a flawed mindset that sees HSR in isolation. HSR needs to be recognized as the backbone of an extensive regional and interregional rail network. Despite the hope that planning would produce a vision for a comprehensive system, TRANSDEF is profoundly disappointed at MTC's mismanagement of the Regional Rail Plan, and its asinine HSR recommendations and final conclusions.	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.
W072-8	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	<p>Nonetheless, the HSR project cannot be meaningfully evaluated on its own. It is only through the synergistic effects of the regional rail network on the HSR system that HSR will achieve maximal environmental benefits. Modeling HSR without the regional rail network will result in ridership calculations that completely ignore the further objective of HSR: "to relieve capacity constraints of the existing transportation system in a manner sensitive to and protective of the Bay Area to Central Valley region's and California's unique natural resources." DPEIR/S at 1-4.</p> <p>Because the level of Bay Area congestion on Highways 80 and 580 is very high, far outstripping conditions in southern Santa Clara County, the Altamont alignment does far more to serve this objective. Ridership calculations done without adding in the regional riders that use the HSR infrastructure are therefore worthless for purposes of determining which alignment produces the maximal social benefits (which should be the determining factor).</p> <p>The goal should be to build a regional rail network that provides frequent BART-level service around the region, using the excess capacity of the HSR infrastructure. Under such a scenario, a train from the southland would be met in Fremont by a train to San Jose, so that, with a platform-to-platform transfer, every train would</p>	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		access San Jose and San Francisco. With regional service assumed like this (or by coupling and uncoupling trainsets), the two alignments will have the same frequency of service. This then will result in meaningful ridership calculations, in which Altamont is sure to have more total riders.	
W072-9	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	<p>Growth Inducement</p> <p>We contend the findings of the growth inducement analysis fail to pass the common sense test, and are simply not credible. Peak hour highway conditions between the Bay Area and outlying counties are miserable now and heading towards becoming much worse in 2030. These conditions are represented in the DPEIR/S as the No Project Alternative. They will prevent any kind of substantial expansion of commuting into the Bay Area. Under the Network Alternatives, one would expect Central Valley employment, Table 5.3-2, to drop below the No Project Alternative as Central Valley residents stream onto HSR in search of the Bay Area's higher wages. But it doesn't. Similarly, one would expect Bay Area employment with the Network Alternatives in Table 5.3-2 to increase sharply in relation to the No Project Alternative, as a large pool of lower-cost-of-living employees becomes accessible.</p> <p>The fact that the growth inducement analysis fails to show a substantial change in employment between the No Project and Network Alternatives indicates that the model considers the travel connection between the Bay Area and the Central Valley to be convenient enough. That finding clashes with everyday traffic reports that always have problems. Given how bad the traffic is now, it is especially egregious that the DPEIR/S concludes that adding HSR does little to change travel patterns, i.e., induce growth. This whole section needs to be redone, starting with accurate traffic counts now and into the future.</p>	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.
W072-10	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	<p>Statewide Growth</p> <p>With urbanized land in the core study area projected to increase by an astonishing 40% between 2000 and 2030 (at 5-12), it is clear that HST and a comprehensive Smart Growth mitigation package could play a dramatic role in reducing the environmental impacts of a projected tremendous increase in population and jobs. In the absence of a State growth management regime, a statewide project EIR serves as a de facto state plan.</p> <p>The DPEIR/S must propose mitigations for this massive projected increase in sprawl. Mitigations are tested by studying how the alternatives compare to the 2005 baseline, as well as to the No Project Alternative. Mitigations that should be evaluated:</p>	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>Drop the planned and funded transportation highway improvements that are assumed in the No Project Alternative. Use the funding to instead build a network of intraregional trains that connect with the HSR network.¹</p> <p>Assume that voters authorize a shift in Proposition 1B Transportation Bond funds from highways to HSR. Calculate the reduction in GHG emissions resulting from building out the HSR system sooner.</p> <p>Propose a Blueprint for 2030 for the Project core study area minus the 9 Bay Area counties (which already have a Smart Growth Plan), modeled on SACOG's Blueprint, with higher densities outside and much less conversion of vacant land.</p> <p>Propose Indirect Source Mitigation Fees similar to those in place in the San Joaquin Valley, but increase the cost high enough to restrain the growth of large lot subdivisions.</p> <p>Assume a \$1.00 increase in the gas tax, with revenues used to fund bus and shuttle operations, following a Constitutional Amendment by voters to authorize transit use of gas tax receipts.</p>	
W072-11	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>TRANSDEF was very involved in preparing the extensive comments submitted by our attorney, Stuart Flashman. We appreciate this opportunity to provide additional comments to the CAHSRA. We hope that the agency will seriously consider what we have said here, and decide to work on behalf of the people of the State of California to provide the greatest benefit to the greatest number.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>DAVID SCHONBRUNN</p> <p>President</p>	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.
W072-12	Mr. David Schonbrunn / President / TRANSDEF	<p>¹ For an off-the-shelf set of assumptions to model this scenario, see the TRANSDEF Smart Growth RTP Alternative in MTC's 2005 RTP FEIR, Appendix D.1. All highway funds were transferred to transit projects. Many new bus lines were initiated. HSR was built. The transit network definition files are available from MTC.</p>	Please see Responses to Comment Letter O006.
W073-1	Mr. Doug DeLong / Opportunistic Activist / Mountain View, CA	<p>Gentlepersons,</p> <p>Thank you for providing the public the opportunity to comment on the Draft Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train (HST) Program EIR/EIS and for extending the comment period through October 26, 2007.</p>	Comment acknowledged.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W073-2	Mr. Doug DeLong / Opportunistic Activist / Mountain View, CA	Lest it get lost in the details below, I must dispense with a bit of unpleasantness and state that the offered draft document is: - non-responsive to scoping comments;	Comment acknowledged.
W073-3	Mr. Doug DeLong / Opportunistic Activist / Mountain View, CA	- fails to study an adequate range of alternatives; and	Please see Standard Responses 1 and 2.
W073-4	Mr. Doug DeLong / Opportunistic Activist / Mountain View, CA	- fails to adequately disclose, analyze, and/or propose mitigations for significant environmental impacts (primarily in relation to the Grasslands Ecological Area and associated biological resources).	Please see Standard Response 5. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters L029 and O011.
W073-5	Mr. Doug DeLong / Opportunistic Activist / Mountain View, CA	Therefore, by virtue of those shortcomings and notice of them being tendered in this comment submission, should the California High-Speed Rail Authority attempt to certify a final EIR/EIS without correcting these deficiencies there is the possibility that injunctive relief could be sought through the courts to prevent work on the subject portion of the proposed network until those deficiencies are corrected.	Please refer to Responses to Comment O006-3.
W073-6	Mr. Doug DeLong / Opportunistic Activist / Mountain View, CA	<p>Scoping Comment Responsiveness</p> <p>When I submitted my scoping comments for this environmental review process almost 2 years ago now I felt a bit like Don Quixote tilting at windmills. The thrust of those scoping comments was essentially 2-fold: expand the geographic range of alternatives to be studied and consider constructing more than one connection between the Bay Area and the Central Valley.</p> <p>I am pleased to note that the offered draft does indeed examine alternatives that include more than one connection (and quantifying the additional cost involved) and was additionally pleased to hear some elected officials at the Stockton hearing support such a proposal. Further, it was enlightening to hear that such an approach might have a benefit I never thought about - reducing the number of tracks needed over the Altamont alignment. So that portion of my scoping comments was responded to, but that response was unfortunately limited by the omission of response to the other portion - expanding the geographic scope of alternatives.</p> <p>It would appear that restricting candidate alternatives to those that lie within certain arbitrary geographic boundaries has no supportable basis relative to NEPA/CEQA requirements. Even if the Legislature directed that alternatives within those boundaries be studied, that direction cannot be interpreted as preventing study of other alternatives outside those boundaries because such an interpretation would be contrary to the statutory requirements imposed by NEPA/CEQA.</p>	Acknowledged. The Authority and FRA disagree with this assessment. Please refer to Chapter 2, "Alternatives," and the Authority's and FRA's certified statewide program EIR/EIS (November 2005).

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>I therefore re-iterate my scoping comment that the area of candidate connection alternatives should be expanded to at least encompass a north bay connection and a connection significantly more southerly than either Pacheco Pass or the previously rejected Pinoche Pass routes.</p>	
W073-7	<p>Mr. Doug DeLong / Opportunistic Activist / Mountain View, CA</p>	<p>Range of Alternatives Studied</p> <p>As stated above, the alternatives studied were arbitrarily constrained to those between the Altamont and Pacheco Pass routes.</p> <p>This eliminated consideration of a north bay connection extending through to Sacramento as specifically requested in my scoping comments. Since those earlier comments were submitted, the Bay Area Regional Rail Plan has been completed. The public study process that led to its production identified additional north bay connectivity as a need to be satisfied, both for the regional BART system (with its proprietary, non-interoperable design) and for longer distance rail travel, as well as additional capacity between Oakland and Sacramento. So my personal, perhaps quixotic, suggestion would appear to have received some institutional legitimacy in the interim.</p> <p>Although not as directly validated, I think some benefits of the more southerly connection I asked to be studied in my scoping comments have also become evident in the interim. It was always obvious that using a Paso Robles/Wasco connection in place of either Altamont or Pacheco Pass to reach southern California from the Bay Area would produce the fastest trip times (fewer route miles and fewer stops en route).</p> <p>Ridership studies now indicate that building only the Altamont route would require a 4-track ROW due to the heavy regional overlay service demand in that corridor. So if Pacheco Pass could serve as a reliever to Altamont, Paso Robles/Wasco would do it even better, taking traffic off the Central Valley line at a more southerly point.</p> <p>A Paso Robles/Wasco connection also offers some interesting environmental advantages. First and most obviously it would not go through or near the Grasslands Ecological Area as the Pacheco Pass route would most certainly do. More subtly, construction of a Paso Robles/Wasco connection could result in removal of an existing rail line through the Elkhorn Slough wildlife area, a line that plagues Union Pacific with persistent signal problems due to tidal wetting of the ballast.</p> <p>By re-routing the existing Union Pacific Coast Subdivision between Gilroy and Salinas as a partnership with Union Pacific in conjunction with construction of HST trackage (the remainder along their ROW between San Jose and Paso Robles), a Paso Robles/Wasco connection would avoid new GEA biological impacts and remove</p>	<p>Please see Response to Comment W073-6.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>existing impacts at Elkhorn Slough. From an EIR/EIS perspective it doesn't get much better than that.</p> <p>I therefore re-iterate my scoping comments that additional alternatives should be studied, including: 1) a north bay crossing extending through to Sacramento and 2) continuing the HST ROW south from San Jose through Gilroy and continuing south through Salinas to Paso Robles before crossing into the Central Valley to a connection near Wasco with the Central Valley line. The latter would follow the existing Union Pacific Coast Subdivision ROW except for the re-routing discussed above between Gilroy and Salinas.</p>	
W073-8	Mr. Doug DeLong / Opportunistic Activist / Mountain View, CA	<p>Inadequate disclosure, analysis, and/or mitigation of environmental impacts</p> <p>Although this is somewhat outside my personal expertise, it is my understanding that others, including responsible government agencies, have expressed their detailed concerns under separate cover. I would simply note that the real teeth of NEPA/CEQA require adequate disclosure on impacts and that does not appear to have occurred up to this point in this particular environmental review process.</p> <p>Therefore, with the other concerns discussed above requiring substantial revisions to the draft EIR/EIS in addition to additional impact disclosure, I would request that a revised draft be re-circulated for public comment before any agency consideration of certification is undertaken.</p>	Please refer to Response to Comment O006-3.
W073-9	Mr. Doug DeLong / Opportunistic Activist / Mountain View, CA	Thank you again for this opportunity to comment and participate in this public process.	Comment acknowledged.
W074-10	Mr. Andre Luthard / San Jose, CA	<p>I would strongly support the Authority taking a close look at developing trackage in both the Altamont and Pacheco alignment. I recently attended a public meeting of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission where it was suggested that instead of building a 4-track section through either pass, two double track segments could be built. Envisioning HSR as part of a regional rail plan for Northern California, certain HSR and regional services could be routed over Altamont, while statewide trains to/from the south would follow Pacheco. Travel times from the Bay Area to Sacramento would be reduced while durations to the very important Southern California market would be optimized. Environmental concerns and land acquisition costs may be able to be addressed more easily due to the reduced right-of-way requirements of a double track system in selected areas. A dual route option also appears to provide the highest combined ridership between inter-regional and intra-regional areas. A HSR route that provides "best of both worlds" benefits also would enable community leaders from the South Bay and the East Bay to get on board with</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. The Authority and FRA believe that the Preferred Alternative along with the Authority's current work with the region to implement improvements in the Altamont Corridor (as a separate but related project) are consistent with MTC's recommendations to the Authority and the Bay Area Regional Rail Plan.



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>HSR together rather than bicker about which cities get to have HSR.</p> <p>I am a huge HSR supporter, but also believe that HSR needs to be an integral part of a coordinated transit solution. Looking out for what is best for the Northern California region while also maximizing the benefits to potential riders is vitally important.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
W075-1	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	These are my comments regarding the Draft Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Program EIR/EIS, in no particular order. Most of these comments could be applied throughout the HST system:	Comment acknowledged.
W075-2	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	1. The routes selected should be designed around the shortest route to reduce travel time from furthest Northern destination to furthest Southern destination. In previous released documents the critical time was about 3 hours. This shouldn't be forgotten as a trip from Sacramento (or points north) to San Diego (in the South), could surpass this.	Comment acknowledged.
W075-3	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	2. Keep in mind how riding these trains will be, FROM THE PASSENGER'S PERSPECTIVE. We want something that passengers will enjoy, this will make it their preferred method of travel, instead of flying. Therefore, please don't try to hide this train in some channel, or think of it as some kind of eyesore. We should be proud of our trains! By having a train that is somewhat raised by building up the earth below the tracks, these trains will be more prominent, and give the riders a good view of the surrounding terrain. This isn't to say everything should be elevated. Only that we should keep in mind what a rider would experience. By having objects or structures too close to the train, a passenger might get motion sickness. By elevating, passengers may not experience this, as their view would overlook nearby objects, reducing this effect.	Comment acknowledged.
W075-4	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	3. If feasible, auto traffic should be routed UNDER Train crossings. The reason I recommend this is for safety. When bridges for auto traffic go over rail traffic, there is always a possibility of debris or automobiles getting onto the track. This actually occurred in Los Angeles on the Metro Rail, Green Line, which already has a dedicated track, with offset grade crossings (the car went over the edge of the bridge, landing on the track). Even though there will be a warning system, it's better to have safety designed in from the beginning, and not have the potential for possible delays in service, or accidents. By having non-rail traffic move below the train, it's highly unlikely that debris will move upwards and onto the HST track.	Comment acknowledged. The specific design of grade separations will be part of future project-level analysis.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W075-5	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	4. Include as many known destinations along the route as possible. This means, when selecting the specific route, include Airports, Main Highways, Leisure spots, etc. Some people would prefer the train doesn't go anywhere near a park, but that's exactly one of the places we would like our trains to go, so we aren't forced to drive there.	Comment acknowledged.
W075-6	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	5. Since the HSRA will be using existing Rights-Of-Way as much as possible, the High Speed Train will compete directly with all existing transportation modes that share the same route. This means any other transportation mode that might have an express train or bus covering local communities will lose passengers to the HST. This will just be a fact of life as high speed trains are built. This isn't something to be afraid of, it just means people will gravitate to the best transportation method for their respective commute. Persons traveling shorter distances will still need the local bus and train service, so somehow existing ROW might need to be acquired to allow for local commuter trains to continue running, without impacting the HST schedules. In the Bay area this will affect the Caltrain, and in Southern California, Metrolink.	Comment acknowledged.
W075-7	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	6. This is just a reminder that the train system selected, steel wheels on steel rail (with slower top speed), was mainly due to the use of sharing existing tracks along the Caltrain route (in the north), and Metrolink (in the south). If it is determined that rail tracks cannot be shared due to affecting schedules on local commuter trains, then staying with steel wheels and steel rail would no longer an issue. Therefore, Maglev may again be a better choice for this system. I wouldn't argue about the reliability of steel wheel on steel rail. It has been proven for many years.	Comment acknowledged.
W075-8	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	7. Regarding the routes of the HST into the Bay Area, I could see from online comments that everyone has reasons for wanting them nearby, which is a good thing. What people are forgetting is, the HST will have to be built in stages. This doesn't mean your city will be left out, but it may not be a first priority. Although, some cities might be left out entirely. This got me to thinking about station locations and train stops. Yes, we want a fast train, which means it cannot stop at ever station, but specific routes and train stops can be flexible. Therefore, even though there could be many stations along a route in the Bay Area, servicing many cities, not all stations need to be stopping points on every train coming into the area. There could be an alternating pattern, where more cities are serviced but less frequently.	Comment acknowledged.
W075-9	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	8. To get these trains up and running as fast as possible, it seems to me the shortest route from Los Angeles to San Francisco should be selected. This would mean selecting a route through the Pacheco Pass, through Gilroy, San Jose, then	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		north to San Francisco. There were several paths through the Pacheco Pass. I would like to see the one where the fewest tunnels would be drilled. At every entry and exit point into a tunnel, there is the potential for debris to land on the HST track (even with a warning system), which could cause a potential accident. Remember, we live in earthquake country. It isn't a matter of IF SOMETHING WILL LAND ON THE TRACK, IT'S A MATTER OF WHEN. I'd like to err on the side of safety, to reduce that possibility.	and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W075-10	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	9. Regarding the complete Bay Area to Central Valley HST system. From looking over the many documents provided, it would appear that all the communities surrounding the Bay Area should be serviced by the HST. I would like to see a HST system BAY LOOP around the whole bay area, with San Jose in the south (no Dumbarton Bridge), and with a Transbay crossing, linking S.F. to Oakland, in the north; a complete loop around the bay. The complete HST build out would include routes heading in and out of this Bay Loop via the Pacheco Pass AND the Altamont Pass. This way commuters coming into the bay area from Modesto or Sacramento would have short transit times, as well as those coming north, which would come into the loop via Pacheco Pass and San Jose. Direct routes should also be included in the Central Valley which would allow trains traveling directly from Los Angeles to Sacramento.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W075-11	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	I'd like to thank the High Speed Rail Authority for the opportunity to comment on this very worthwhile project for our state. Thank You.	Comment acknowledged.
W076-1	Mr. Eric McCaughrin / East Bay Bicycle Coalition / meric@ebbc.org / CA, 94604	In 2004, the East Bay Bicycle Coalition joined with other environmental and transit groups to ask that the Altamont pass option be reconsidered as part of the environmental review process. We applaud the High-Speed Rail Authority for responding to public feedback, and submit the following comments regarding the Bay Area to Central Valley EIR/EIS.	Comment acknowledged.
W076-2	Mr. Eric McCaughrin / East Bay Bicycle Coalition / meric@ebbc.org / CA, 94604	Transbay Service Bicyclists in the East Bay are all too aware of the severe bottlenecks for transbay travel. Toll bridges are gridlocked (and generally off-limits for bicycle travel). The BART transbay tube is operating well beyond its design capacity. Today, bicyclists cannot board BART trains during commute hours, and within the next 10-20 years, regular passengers will also suffer commute hour "blackouts". The Concord line is especially at risk: peak hour loads between Rockridge and downtown San Francisco are reaching standing-room-only limits.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>Contrary to public testimony heard at the San Jose Public Hearing, the new Bay rail crossing is a key advantage of the Altamont alternative. Because it would take huge pressure off the BART transbay tube, the EIR/EIS should highlight this advantage.</p>	
<p>W076-3</p>	<p>Mr. Eric McCaughrin / East Bay Bicycle Coalition / meric@ebbc.org / CA, 94604</p>	<p>Bicycle Access</p> <p>Chapter 6 "HST Station Area Development" calls for a "grid street pattern" that promotes walking and bicycle access. EBBC supports this concept, and also recommends adoption of BART's Bicycle Access "Toolkit" - a set of design standards for station design, including signage and secure bike parking. Maximum feasible accommodation for bicycles (and other types of luggage) should be provided on trains, particularly the regional and suburban services.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please refer to Chapter 6, "Station Area Development," of this Final Program EIR/EIS. The Authority believes that planning for bicycles is an essential component of station design and for transit-oriented development at station areas. It is also the Authority's adopted policy that HST trains should provide accommodation for bicycles. The adoption of BART's Bicycle Access "Toolkit" is beyond the scope of this project-level process, but this may be considered at the project-level should the project move forward.</p>
<p>W076-4</p>	<p>Mr. Eric McCaughrin / East Bay Bicycle Coalition / meric@ebbc.org / CA, 94604</p>	<p>Ridership Analysis</p> <p>Ridership analysis for the Bay Area - Los Angeles segment appears to rely on a dubious assumption. Page 11 of the Report Summary, states the following:</p> <p>"The Altamont Pass network alternatives would require the system to split in two separate directions to serve both San Jose and San Francisco given a constant number of trains. This decreases the frequency of service from other markets in the state to these stations by a factor of two, as compared to network alternatives using the Pacheco Pass alignment alternatives."</p> <p>As noted in our 2004 comments, "splitting" trains does not necessarily result in decreased service to San Jose. By using timed cross-platform connections, the Altamont alternative can provide service to San Jose with no decrease in frequency. For example, a passenger departing from San Jose on a Sacramento-bound train could transfer to the San Francisco-Los Angeles train at a multi-modal station in Fremont or Pleasanton. This is similar to BART system operations, where trains split off in four directions at Oakland. On BART's heavily used Richmond line, a 1-seat ride into San Francisco has a 15 minute headway, but when the timed transfer at</p>	<p>There is a decided disadvantage in requiring intercity travelers to transfer between trains. Research on the TGV Atlantique line¹ has shown that this transfer "penalty" can amount to up to 60 minutes of equivalent in-vehicle time for intercity travelers, which would greatly outweigh any benefit from increased frequency to San Jose and San Francisco. This penalty is much higher than the 8- to 10-minute values typically associated with commuter rail and rapid transit systems such as BART². The research paper also pointed out several other critical problems with an integrated timed transfer system, including inefficient facility usage, reliability problems, and difficulty in varying service headways to match demand throughout the day.</p>

¹ Clever, Reinhard; "Integrated Timed Transfer: A European Perspective"; in Transportation Research Record 1571.

² "Journal of Public Transportation"; Vol 8, No 1; pg 46.



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>MacArthur (and 12th Street) is counted, the headway is actually 7.5 minutes. While much attention has focused on the Bay Area to Los Angeles segment, the business plan showed a substantial fraction of daily ridership would be commute trips. For Bay Area voters, the real value added for this project is not so much the ability to visit Southern California, but rather the improvements in their daily commute. Thus, there is an error of omission in the EIR/EIS: a complete lack of analysis of the potential for commuter, suburban, regional types of travel possible with this project. The only mention is a single sentence on Page 2-11, which indicates 69,000 daily commuters. The report does not indicate how this figure was derived, nor does it distinguish commuter figures for the various alignment options. The 69,000 figure seems an underestimate based on today's census figures, let alone what may be expected by the year 2030.</p> <p>The ridership analysis should provide a system approach for all destinations, rather than focus exclusively on the Los Angeles to Bay Area market. The EIS/EIR provides little information on Sacramento ridership. We note that the Altamont "local-service" alternative adds \$6 billion to the total cost of the project. In the event the Pacheco alignment is constructed, the Altamont local-service option would be required to provide time-competitive service to Sacramento. For this scenario, the EIR/EIS needs to evaluate the cost per trip for Sacramento (and Tri-Valley) service, versus other design alternatives. We are also doubtful that \$6 billion in private investment capital can be obtained for Sacramento service.</p>	<p>The ridership and revenue model used for the Program EIR/EIS explicitly forecasts HST's ability to capture all types of travel across California, including commuter, suburban, and regional types; it does not "focus exclusively on the Los Angeles to Bay Area market." Please see Response to Comment L006-8 for availability of ridership information for Sacramento and other markets.</p> <p>About 30% of HST's projected ridership is commute travel. See Standard Response 4 for a discussion of the commute accessibility potential of HST versus auto, Response to Comment O007-113 for a discussion of general accessibility differences between highways and HST, and Response to Comment O006-6 for a discussion of how access and egress to an HST station affects the door-to-door travel time and cost of HST relative to auto.</p>
W076-5	Mr. Eric McCaughrin / East Bay Bicycle Coalition / meric@ebbc.org / CA, 94604	<p>Caltrain Coordination</p> <p>Page 2-18 states that the current Caltrain Dumbarton Rail project would "conflict" with the proposed HST system. We urge the High-Speed Rail Authority to coordinate with the Caltrain Joint Powers Board in the implementation of a joint Dumbarton crossing. Coordination is especially important as the two agencies will share Caltrain ROW.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>
W076-6	Mr. Eric McCaughrin / East Bay Bicycle Coalition / meric@ebbc.org / CA, 94604	<p>Because the Altamont alignment reduces conflicts between Caltrain and HST service, the EIR/EIS should note some of the operational advantages of the Altamont alignment. Under the Pacheco alternative, HST trains would run the entire length of the highly congested Caltrain corridor -- increasing the possibility of delays to HST due to equipment breakdowns, police actions, and other interruptions along the Caltrain ROW. By comparison, the Altamont alternative would have HST diverge from the shared Caltrain ROW much earlier (at Redwood City), thereby reducing the chances of service disruption. HST operators in other countries follow a similar policy of getting high-speed trains off mainline commuter tracks as early as possible.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W076-7	Mr. Eric McCaughrin / East Bay Bicycle Coalition / meric@ebbc.org / CA, 94604	<p>Future Steps</p> <p>The choice of high-speed rail alignment is critically important, as it will directly affect revenue, ridership, and operating expense. The EBBC hopes the EIR/EIS process will be comprehensive and objective, so that decision makers can move forward based on the best engineering data available. The extensive public scoping process has been an encouraging sign that the Authority is working with stakeholders in a transparent fashion, which will no doubt help make high-speed rail a success in California.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Eric McCaughrin</p> <p>EBBC Board of Directors</p> <p>cc: Robert Raburn</p> <p>EBBC Executive Director</p>	Comment acknowledged.
W077-1	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	<p>Dear Mr. Leavitt,</p> <p>The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the California High-Speed Rail Authority's Draft Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Program Environmental Impact Re-port/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). Although our Commission has not had the opportunity to review the draft EIR/EIS and therefore these are staff comments, they are based on BCDC's law, the McAteer-Petris Act, and the provisions of its San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan).</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.
W077-2	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	<p>As a permitting authority along the San Francisco Bay shoreline, BCDC is responsible for granting or denying permits for all Bay filling, dredging or substantial change in use of land, water or structures within the Bay or on the shoreline, which is defined in the McAteer-Petris Act, as 100 feet landward of, and parallel to, the shoreline of the Bay. BCDC's regulations also require that proposed projects provide maximum feasible public access to the Bay and its shoreline consistent with the proposed project. In addition to the McAteer-Petris Act, an essential part of BCDC's regulatory framework is the Commission's San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan). Projects approved by BCDC must be consistent with the McAteer-Petris Act and the provisions of the Bay Plan.</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.
W077-3	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development	Given the potential adverse impacts that transportation projects can have on Bay resources when located along the Bay shoreline, or in the Bay, it is important that	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
	Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	<p>the planning and design of these facilities is done in a way that both protects and enhances the Bay as a regional resource, while ensuring the viability of a safe and efficient transportation system for the Bay Area. The draft EIR/EIS for the High-Speed Rail service contains a number of different alignments, some that may have impacts on Bay resources and some that would largely avoid the Bay. Those alignments that would have the greatest impact on the Bay are those described within what the draft EIR/EIS calls the San Francisco Bay Crossings Corridor. The alternatives described in this corridor include three alternative locations and seven design alternatives for crossing the Bay, including a new transbay tube connecting Oakland and San Francisco and either a bridge or a tube in the vicinity of the existing Dumbarton Rail Bridge. While each of these alternatives would result in different types of impacts to the Bay, all of the alternatives would result in fill in the Bay and require the provision of maximum feasible public access.</p> <p>If portions of the preferred alignment are located within BCDC's jurisdiction, then the accompanying environmental document should identify the amount of fill proposed, provide an analysis of why that fill is necessary and explain how the proposed fill is the minimum necessary to meet the objectives of the High-Speed Rail project. The project will need to be accompanied by a mitigation package designed to offset the fill in the Bay and by a public access component that would meet BCDC's requirement for maximum feasible public access. The mitigation and public access components should be identified in the environmental document for the selected alignment and should be included in any cost estimates for the Bay crossings alternatives. As was stated in BCDC's comment letter on the NOP, it is important for project proponents and sponsors to contact BCDC early in the project planning phase to allow staff to identify impacts to Bay resources and assist with the mitigation and public access components of the project in a timely fashion.</p>	L032.
W077-4	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	<p>In addition to BCDC's fill and public access requirements, the environmental document for the preferred alternative should include a discussion of how the project is consistent with the findings, policies and priority land use area designations of the Bay Plan. In very general terms, the Bay Plan findings and policies direct that where new infrastructure must be developed or existing infrastructure must be expanded, the alignments chosen should be sited and designed to avoid adverse affects on Bay resources (e.g., tidal marshes, tidal flats, restored areas, habitats that support endangered species) and be consistent with BCDC's priority land use areas. The priority land use areas are an important component of the Bay Plan and were established to ensure that sufficient areas around the Bay are reserved for important water-oriented uses such as ports, water-related industry, wildlife refuges and parks. The draft EIR/EIS includes several alternatives that would result in a new alignment</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		through the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge which is designated by the Bay Plan as a wildlife refuge priority use area. The project should be designed to avoid an alignment that requires the placement of infrastructure in the wildlife refuge. If it is not possible to avoid the placement of infrastructure in the refuge, the design should minimize the impacts to the refuge and mitigate for those unavoidable impacts.	
W077-5	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	The transportation findings and policies of the Bay Plan provide support for public transit facilities, encouraging a reduction in the region's primary reliance on the single-occupant vehicle and the improvement and expansion of systems of transportation that can carry large volumes of people and goods. The High-Speed Rail project is consistent with this objective. Although not stated in the Bay Plan, the region will also be facing increased congestion at the three main commercial airports-San Francisco International Airport, San Jose International Airport and Oakland International Airport. It is possible that a new High-Speed Rail service could help alleviate this congestion, providing an alternative to flights coming from the Central Valley to make connections through Bay Area airports and providing the travelers in the busy Northern to Southern California route an alternative to air travel. Future environmental documents should include further contemplation how High-Speed Rail could complement the service provided at the three main commercial airports and the ways that the two modes could work together to relieve congestion and increase transportation alternatives, particularly during peak travel periods and during emergencies.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.
W077-6	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	The Bay Plan also identifies the impacts that all transportation projects may have on Bay resources, including impacts to public access to the Bay, pedestrian and bicycle movement and important wildlife habitat areas. Historically, rail lines and roadway infrastructure along the Bay shoreline resulted in adverse impacts to non-motorized access, recreation and visual access in many communities near the Bay shoreline. To address these potential impacts, the Bay Plan contains a policy that states "[t]ransportation projects on the Bay shoreline or bridges over the Bay or certain waterways should include pedestrian and bicycle paths that will either be a part of the Bay Trail or connect the Bay Trail with other regional and community trails. Transportation projects should be designed to maintain and enhance visual and physical access to the Bay and along the Bay shoreline." The provision of non-motorized pathways, such as the Bay Trail, grade separated crossings and the support of non-motorized access to any proposed rail stations will help to ensure that the High-Speed Rail project is integrated fully into the existing communities and transportation systems.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W077-7	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	The Bay Plan includes specific policies regarding additional bridges in the Bay, which state that "[i]f any additional bridge is proposed across the Bay, adequate research and testing should determine whether feasible alternative route, transportation mode or operational improvement could overcome the particular congestion problem without placing an additional route in the Bay." The Bay Plan also includes policy direction regarding the design of any additional bridge to be built over the Bay, including the provision that the route be placed in tunnel rather than a bridge if feasible, that toll plazas and service yards are not to be placed on fill in the Bay, that the bridge should be designed to accommodate non-motorized transportation and that the bridge facilities should provide adequate space and be designed so as not to interfere with pedestrian and bicycle access along the Bay shoreline. This policy is particularly relevant for the alternatives located in the vicinity of the Dumbarton Rail Bridge, which have the potential to impact existing public access where the Bay crossing infrastructure touches down at the Bay shoreline on the eastern and western shores of the Bay. The design of the crossing at this location should include all of the provisions listed above, including the provision of non-motorized public access on the bridge and the design should clearly demonstrate that the project enhances existing public access in the area, rather than degrading this existing access.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.
W077-8	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	The transportation findings also identify impacts that are often associated with transportation projects sited in the Bay or along its shoreline, such as increased pollution from runoff and harm to marine mammals and fish from pile-driving for bridge construction. The EIR/EIS for the preferred alignment should include a discussion of these impacts if they are relevant.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.
W077-9	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	For those alignments outside of the San Francisco Bay Crossings Corridor, it appears that the majority of the new High-Speed Rail service would be accommodated by sharing tracks that are currently in use by existing rail passenger and cargo service providers in the Bay Area. Using existing travel corridors should reduce many of the impacts that may be associated with a new train service, however the increase in service on the existing tracks may result in conflicts with the current cargo and passenger services that use the tracks and increase the noise, air quality and public access impacts associated with the service on the tracks.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.
W077-10	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	In addition to the issues described above, the Commission has been collaborating with other regional agencies in the Bay Area to find ways to address climate change and associated sea-level rise. The California High-Speed Rail Authority should include provisions for dealing with sea-level rise in its planning for routes over the Bay and along its shoreline.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W077-11	Ms. Lindy Lowe / Bay Conservation and Development Commission / Senior Planner / San Francisco, CA	<p>BCDC looks forward to working with the California High-Speed Rail Authority to determine the best possible route through the Bay Area, one that would increase travel efficiency and travel options, while minimizing impacts to Bay resources, including public access and wetland habitats. BCDC recognizes that a well-designed High-Speed Rail system serving the Bay Area could reduce congestion at the region's airports, reduce automobile trips, improve air quality and contribute a cleaner way to connect the northern and southern regions of the state. Thank you again for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft EIR/EIS. If you have any questions please contact me at (415) 352-3642.</p> <p>Sincerely, LINDY L. LOWE Senior Planner</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L032.
W078-1	Mr. William Blackwell / self / Architect / Piedmont, CA	<p>Here are four comments/questions regarding information presented in Table S.5-1.</p> <p>1. Track miles for alternatives are given to astonishing accuracy (± 52.8 feet) but where are starting and ending points exactly defined, particularly on the Central Valley side? Is the end-point the same for all alternatives?</p>	The analysis was done at a conceptual level of detail, but the starting and ending points were defined to provide "apples-to-apples" comparisons given the constraints of a conceptual level of detail.
W078-2	Mr. William Blackwell / self / Architect / Piedmont, CA	<p>2. Phasing was ignored. Regarding Altamont Pass alternatives, wouldn't it be reasonable to assume that San Jose terminus alternate 4 would be built first and then the excess revenue of over \$2 billion per year be used to later construct the Dumbarton Bridge, thus completing alternate 9 that would so greatly benefit San Francisco?</p>	As noted, phasing is not considered as part of this Program EIR/EIS.
W078-3	Mr. William Blackwell / self / Architect / Piedmont, CA	<p>3. Ratio of revenue to operating costs varies from 2.4 to 3 for the various alternates. I know of no HSR in the world that operates in the black, much less with revenues two or three times operating costs. Is revenue grossly exaggerated or -are operating costs understated?</p>	The Authority and FRA do not believe that the revenue is "exaggerated" or the operating costs "understated." Contrary to this statement, HST systems worldwide typically operate "in the black" (with passenger revenues exceeding operational and maintenance costs. Please see the Authority's Implementation Plan for more information (available at www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov).
W078-4	Mr. William Blackwell / self / Architect / Piedmont, CA	<p>4. AB 1228 now under consideration specifies maximum SF-Anaheim travel time of 2:42. If the SF-LA express train travel time of 2:36 given in Table S.5-1 is correct, then LA-Anaheim train would have to average about 300 mph. Which number is in</p>	The Authority's HST travel times are listed in Table S.5-1.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		error?	
W079-1	Neerav Handa / Redwood City, CA	Looking at the travel times between San Francisco and Sacramento, it makes sense to use the Altamont Pass through Tracy. Also, using the Altamont Pass does not increase the travel time from San Francisco to Los Angeles (rather the travel time is less by 2 minutes). The route through Altamont pass will also decrease the traffic to I-580 which is a big bottleneck.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W080-1	Lars Carlson / Venice, CA	Choose the fastest alignment! We need this and need to stop bickering!	Comment acknowledged.
W081-1	Mr. Peter M. Dubinsky / Fremont Neighbors / Consultant - Pharma/Biotech / Fremont, CA	I and neighbors in the Niles area of Fremont support the Pacheco Pass alignment for HSR if it is further developed. We do not support the Altamont Pass alignment. The City Council of Fremont issued a letter on/around 11 September 2007 expressing support for the Pacheco Pass alignment and opposing an alignment through Niles Canyon. I and my neighbors agree with the points made in that letter to your offices.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
		In addition I do not recommend that you consider the proposal by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission of the Bay area proposing some form of mixed version of the Pacheco Pass - Altamont alignment. Niles Canyon is already slated for changes described in the Bay Area Regional Rail Plan that may adversely impact it both environmentally and from a quality of life standpoint. Based on all the data I have reviewed the Pacheco Pass alignment as proposed by the CA HSR Authority should serve California in a satisfactory manner. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. The Authority is currently working with the region to identify and implement improvements in the Altamont Pass Corridor as a separate but related project. The Authority believes that the Preferred HST Alternative and its future efforts in the Altamont Pass are consistent with MTC's recommendations and the Bay Area Regional Rail Plan.
W082-1	Mr. Pierre Gasztowtt / San Francisco, CA	<p>The Altamont Pass alignment offers a slightly shorter travel time travel time between San Francisco and Los Angeles, according to the travel time summary tables posted on your website, The Altamont Pass alignment also offers the possibility of high speed service between San Francisco and Sacramento in a not too distant future. Finally, the Altamont Pass alignment is less environmentally sensitive than the Pacheco Pass alignment.</p> <p>I can understand lengthening the trip time to avoid environmentally sensitive land. The Pacheco Pass option lengthens the trip time and crosses environmentally sensitive land: it seems the worst of both worlds.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		Please select the Altamont Pass.	
W083-1	John Aspelin / San Francisco, CA	<p>While I favor a high speed rail project having two Bay Area Central Valley routes is unrealistic and duplicative.</p> <p>It is unrealistic to expect funding for two rail routes.</p> <p>It is duplicative because BART could funnel the entire East Bay into a San Jose BART/High Speed Rail Line.</p> <p>It is not going to make that much of a difference in time to take a BART train from Walnut Creek to San Jose vs. taking a High Speed Rail train from Walnut Creek that stops in Stockton before proceeding south.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W083-2	John Aspelin / San Francisco, CA	<p>I am also unclear how the train will share the existing rail lines from S.F. to San Jose. Does this mean that the High Speed train will travel at a reduced speed to San Jose. Will CalTrain yield the right of way to the High Speed Train? What will this do to the existing CalTrain service?</p> <p>Please advise.</p>	The HST system is expected to operate at maximum speeds between 100 and 125 miles per hour along the San Francisco Peninsula. Please refer to the conceptual engineering provided in Volume II, including the conceptual cross sections. Between San Francisco and San Jose, the alignment is envisioned to be a completely grade-separated, electrified, four-track infrastructure where the two interior tracks are shared between HST and express Caltrain and the two outer tracks are used by local Caltrain services and some possible overnight freight operations. The Authority, FRA, MTC, and Caltrain, SamTrans, and other agencies believe that HST on the Caltrain corridor will greatly benefit Caltrain and the San Francisco Peninsula.
W084-1	Ms. Laura Thompson / Association of Bay Area Governments / Bay Trail Project Manager / Oakland, CA	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Program EIR/EIS. The San Francisco Bay Trail Project is a nonprofit organization administered by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) that plans, promotes and advocates for the implementation of a continuous 500-mile bicycling and hiking path around San Francisco Bay. When complete, the trail will pass through 47 cities, all nine Bay Area counties, and cross seven toll bridges. To date, 290 miles, slightly more than half the length of the Bay Trail alignment has been developed.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses for Comment Letter L024.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W084-2	Ms. Laura Thompson / Association of Bay Area Governments / Bay Trail Project Manager / Oakland, CA	Proximity to San Francisco Bay is one of the most defining characteristics of the Bay Trail. The trail provides unique vistas and open spaces but also connects urban areas and provides alternative transportation opportunities. The proposed high-speed rail corridors could potentially impact existing and proposed Bay Trail alignments.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses for Comment Letter L024.
W084-3	Ms. Laura Thompson / Association of Bay Area Governments / Bay Trail Project Manager / Oakland, CA	<p>Plans and Policies</p> <p>The Final Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Program EIR/EIS should include specific mention of the Bay Trail Plan in the Plans and Policies section. For your information, State Senate Bill 100, passed into law in 1987, directed the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to develop a plan "for a continuous recreational corridor which will extend around the perimeter of San Francisco and San Pablo Bays." The Bay Trail Plan, adopted by ABAG in July 1989, includes a proposed alignment; a set of policies to guide the future selection, design and implementation of routes; and strategies for implementation and financing. Resolutions of support have been passed in all shoreline jurisdictions recognizing the importance of this regional project.</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses for Comment Letter L024.
W084-4	Ms. Laura Thompson / Association of Bay Area Governments / Bay Trail Project Manager / Oakland, CA	<p>San Francisco Bay Crossing</p> <p>Of the six proposed high speed rail alternative corridors identified in the draft EIR/S: San Francisco to San Jose, Oakland to San Jose, San Jose to Central Valley, East Bay to Central Valley, San Francisco Bay Crossings, and Central Valley, only the San Francisco Bay Crossing rail alignment alternative has features that could potentially impact the Bay Trail. Described on page S-8 in the draft document, this alternative would serve the Altamont Pass alignment connecting the San Francisco Peninsula to the East Bay. See Exhibit A, a map identifying the Bay Trail alignment and the proposed rail corridors in the South Bay.</p> <p>On the west side of San Francisco Bay in San Mateo County, the Bay Trail Plan identifies existing and planned Bay Trail spine in both the City of Menlo Park and East Palo Alto. There is a gap in the Bay Trail between Menlo Park and East Palo Alto that runs along University Avenue, and parallel to the existing rails with future connection to the existing trails in the Ravenswood Open Space Preserve (see Exhibit B). The City of Menlo Park, in an effort to develop alternatives for completing this gap, conducted a Bay Trail Feasibility Study funded in part by the Bay Trail Project. The final High Speed Rail Project EIR/S should address the preferred alignment alternative at that location and discuss potential impacts on the Bay Trail of an active rail corridor, a new station, cut and fill associated with construction, an at-grade structure and it should also take into consideration the Bay Trail and local jurisdiction missions to provide safe and direct access to the bay and shoreline.</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses for Comment Letter L024.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W084-5	Ms. Laura Thompson / Association of Bay Area Governments / Bay Trail Project Manager / Oakland, CA	Highway 84 along the Dumbarton Bridge provides a vehicle connection between the San Francisco Peninsula and the East Bay. The bridge also has a separated multi-use pathway that is part of the Bay Trail system, used by bicyclists and pedestrians to cross the Bay. The Final EIR/S should include discussion of the preferred alternative for this area, including new high-level bridge or a new transbay tube, and their impacts on existing and proposed Bay Trail segments. The Final EIR/S should also include a discussion of incorporating a trail crossing in conjunction with the rail over-crossing.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses for Comment Letter L024.
W084-6	Ms. Laura Thompson / Association of Bay Area Governments / Bay Trail Project Manager / Oakland, CA	On the East Bay side of the Dumbarton Bridge, the Bay Trail exists as bike lanes on Marshlands Road connecting south to the existing trails at the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge and north to Coyote Hills Regional Park (Exhibit B). The draft EIR/S shows the rail as an aerial structure at that location (Figure 2.5-3). The final High Speed Rail project EIR/S should discuss impacts of this structure on the Bay Trail and connecting trails as well as the impacts on the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses for Comment Letter L024.
W084-7	Ms. Laura Thompson / Association of Bay Area Governments / Bay Trail Project Manager / Oakland, CA	General Comments The final EIR/S should also address: • connections to existing and proposed regional trails such as the Bay Trail • specific required setback distances between rail corridors and existing trails • opportunities for locating trails on the same rail crossing structure • crossing information and their warning systems • accommodations for bicycles on trains, in parking structures and in train stations • access to other means of public transit	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses for Comment Letter L024.
W084-8	Ms. Laura Thompson / Association of Bay Area Governments / Bay Trail Project Manager / Oakland, CA	As referenced above, the Bay Trail is a regional trail passing through all nine Bay Area counties, and is an important recreational amenity. The Trail alignment is in close proximity to, crosses, or is directly parallel to the rail line in many locations. The final EIR/S should address impacts to the San Francisco Bay Trail as a regionally important recreation amenity and alternative transportation corridor.	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses for Comment Letter L024.
W084-9	Ms. Laura Thompson / Association of Bay Area Governments / Bay Trail Project Manager / Oakland, CA	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR/S. I can be reached at (510) 464-7935 or at LauraT@abag.ca.gov if you have any questions about the comments in this letter. Sincerely, Laura Thompson	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses for Comment Letter L024.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		Bay Trail Project Manager	
W085-1	Whitney Seiler / University of Washington / Belvedere, CA	This project will HUGELY improve traffic and air pollution conditions as well as decrease our dependence on oil, however I am concerned at the potential for wildlife destruction during the building process. I urge the planning committees to make sure that we are not sacrificing our local ecosystems under the pretenses of protecting our global environment. With appropriate planning, these two goals do not need to be mutually exclusive to improve public transportation across our huge state with the high speed rail.	Comment acknowledged.
W086-1	Mr. Edward Thompson / American Farmland Trust / California Director / Davis, CA	American Farmland Trust, a national agricultural conservation organization that has operated in California since 1983 and now has more than 3,000 members in the state, respectfully submits these comments on the Programmatic DEIR for the Bay Area-to-Central Valley portion of the project, which are due October 26, 2007. Our principal concern is the unnecessary loss of farmland to development.	Comment acknowledged.
W086-2	Mr. Edward Thompson / American Farmland Trust / California Director / Davis, CA	1. As did the 2005 programmatic EIR for the entire project, this DEIR continues to downplay the growth-inducing impacts of the project on the Central Valley, California's premier agricultural region. While the Central Valley will certainly continue to grow without HSR, it defies all credibility to conclude, as the DEIR does, that the land use consequences of bringing almost the entire Valley within an hour's travel time from the Bay Area and/or Los Angeles will be no different than if the travel time actually increases for most of the Valley due to traffic congestion. If we accept the significant transportation benefits of HSR, we must face up to the equally significant downside of induced growth.	Please see Standard Response 4 regarding growth.
W086-3	Mr. Edward Thompson / American Farmland Trust / California Director / Davis, CA	2. This DEIR also continues to postpone serious consideration of the induced growth impacts and, in particular, measures that could mitigate these impacts. If put off until a final alignment is selected, the opportunity to mitigate will probably be lost because of land speculation and the development expectations it will create. Locating stations downtown and maximizing multi-modal options are praiseworthy measures that will undoubtedly have some impact in concentrating the growth induced by HSR. But by themselves they are not likely to be enough to prevent sprawl on an unprecedented scale in the Central Valley.	Please see Standard Responses 4 and 5 and Chapter 6, "Station Area Development."
W086-4	Mr. Edward Thompson / American Farmland Trust / California Director / Davis, CA	3. In particular, we believe that the DEIR should explicitly study the alternative of conditioning HSR on a regional compact, to which the state would be a partner, that would require local governments to adopt effective growth management measures of their own choosing to minimize conversion of farmland and habitat before any land or interest therein may be acquired for rights of way, stations or other HSR facilities.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 4 and Chapters 5 and 6. The Authority and FRA do not believe it is necessary to undertake the study you have suggested as part of this Program EIR/EIS.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>For purposes of analysis, the compact should assume -</p> <p>A goal of limiting the urbanization of land in the Central Valley (and other impacted agricultural areas such as the Pajaro Valley between Hollister and Gilroy) to not more than 500,000 acres by 2050, which would entail a doubling of the current per capita rate of urban conversion, which is about one acre for every 8 people, to a rate comparable to the recent trend in Southern California;</p> <p>That each city and county would have to do its fair share (determined through a process similar to the Regional Housing Needs Assessment) to meet this goal by increasing urban infill, residential densities and commercial floor-to-area ratios, and by minimizing rural ranchette development; and</p> <p>That some kind of accountability mechanism would assure that local governments take effective action to implement their fair share goals. One such mechanism could be a regional mitigation fee or in lieu requirement for new development projects based on the extent to which their per capita land conversion rate meets or falls short of standards set by cities and counties to meet their fair share goal.</p>	
W086-5	Mr. Edward Thompson / American Farmland Trust / California Director / Davis, CA	AFT would be glad to work with the California High Speed Rail Authority and its consultants to flesh out and help analyze such an alternative.	Please see Response to Comment W086-4.
W086-6	Mr. Edward Thompson / American Farmland Trust / California Director / Davis, CA	<p>In conclusion, we repeat what we said in our comments on the 2005 project DEIR: The proposed high speed train system could be one of the best things ever to happen in California - or one of the worst. It could harness tremendous civic enthusiasm to build diverse, efficient, livable communities in the midst of a living landscape of sustainable agriculture and a healthy environment. But without a comparable effort to harness the development it will attract, especially to the Central Valley, the system could be a 'train wreck' for agriculture, for the environment and for every Californian who will end up paying the bill for sprawl. If, on the other hand, we marry the excitement of high-speed rail and the responsibility of smart growth - and only if we do so - we will avoid the 'train wreck' and build a better California where our freeways are less congested, our skies are less crowded, our environment is cleaner, our housing is more affordable and our agriculture can still be counted on to feed America and the world</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Edward Thompson, Jr.</p> <p>California Director</p>	Comment acknowledged.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		American Farmland Trust	
W087-1	Mr. Rudolph Rosen / Ducks Unlimited / Rancho Cordova, CA	<p>Dear Members of the Board:</p> <p>These comments extend oral comments I presented to the California High-Speed Rail Authority Board at its September 26, 2007 meeting held in Sacramento regarding the Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Draft Program Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement and the concerns of Ducks Unlimited about potential impacts of any alignment of the railway that would route high-speed trains and the railway corridor through or adjacent to the Grasslands Ecological Area (GEA). Ducks Unlimited's recommendation to the Board in September, and now, is that the high-speed railway be sited away from the GEA. We urge the Board to select an Altamont Pass alignment to avoid impacting the GEA and its waterfowl and wildlife habitat. Here is why we make this recommendation.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters O011 and L029.</p>
W087-2	Mr. Rudolph Rosen / Ducks Unlimited / Rancho Cordova, CA	<p>The GEA is located west of the City of Merced and surrounding the City of Los Banos to the north, east and south. Originally, this area was part of a four million acre wetland system in the Central Valley. Of the 300,000 acres that remain, the GEA's 180,000 acres is the largest contiguous block of wetlands left in the Central Valley. The GEA is comprised of wetlands, riparian woodlands, native grasslands, vernal pools, and other habitats which support abundant and diverse wildlife, all of which has been designated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service as a priority area for protection and enhancement. It is a critical wintering habitat for migratory birds. As much as 20% of all Pacific Flyway waterfowl use the GEA's wetlands during winter. Waterfowl numbers in the GEA average one-half million to up to one-million birds.</p> <p>Protection of the GEA's wetlands has been a high priority for Ducks Unlimited. The GEA includes federal wildlife refuges, a state park, state wildlife management areas and the largest block of privately managed wetlands in the state. The GEA also includes a growing number of federal and state conservation easements, now totaling over 64,000 acres.</p> <p>Ducks Unlimited has worked with over 120 private landowners and on all the state and federal public waterfowl areas in the GEA completing over 160 projects to improve wetlands for waterfowl. Ducks Unlimited is a nonprofit waterfowl and wetland habitat conservation organization with a mission to conserve, restore, and manage wetlands and associated habitats for North America's waterfowl. Our over one million members, supporters, and volunteers, along with our partners, have invested over \$2.32 billion since 1937 to conserve over 11,661,000 acres of wetlands in North America.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>The GEA also provides habitat for more than 550 species of plants and animals, including 47 species listed by the state or federal government as endangered, threatened or candidates to be. The Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network has designated the GEA as an international shorebird reserve, one of only 15 such internationally significant sites in the world. The GEA was also recently recognized as a Wetland of International Importance by the Ramsar Convention, a recognition reserved for only the world's most important ecosystems. Only 22 such sites have ever been designated in the United States.</p>	
W087-3	Mr. Rudolph Rosen / Ducks Unlimited / Rancho Cordova, CA	<p>According to Ducks Unlimited's biologists and wetlands experts, among the railway's potential impacts to migratory birds and other wildlife, should the alignment run through or adjacent to the GEA, would be interference with wildlife corridors, habitat fragmentation, disruption of water flow and other hydrological impacts that could accompany fragmentation, interference with access to hunting clubs, wildlife collision with trains, construction impacts, water quality impacts, and the overall impact of increased development through suburban and urban expansion in the area surrounding the GEA that could have an indirect impact on waterfowl and wetlands.</p>	Please see Response to Comment Letter O011.
W087-4	Mr. Rudolph Rosen / Ducks Unlimited / Rancho Cordova, CA	<p>Ducks Unlimited takes exception to routing the new railway through or adjacent to the GEA, due to the potential affect on migratory birds. This is a concern echoed by managers of state and federal refuges in the GEA, and officials at the Grasslands Water District which represents the interests of many of the area's private wetlands owners.</p>	Please see Response to Comment Letter O011.
W087-5	Mr. Rudolph Rosen / Ducks Unlimited / Rancho Cordova, CA	<p>Ducks Unlimited urges the Board to select an alignment that completely avoids impacting the GEA, thus we urge selection of an Altamont Pass alignment.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Rudolph A. Rosen, Ph.D.</p> <p>Director</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. Please also see Responses to Comment Letters O011 and L029. There will be no Los Banos station as part of the HST system. Please also see Chapter 8 and the Summary of this Final Program EIR/EIS.</p>
W088-1	Ms. Katie Stevens / California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley / Government Affairs Coordinator / Fresno, CA	<p>Dear Chairperson Kopp:</p> <p>On behalf of the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley (Partnership), we thank you for this opportunity to submit comments for consideration by the California High-Speed Rail Authority and the Federal Railroad Administration regarding the draft EIR/EIS for the Central Valley to Bay Area Corridor. In regard to alignment, the</p>	<p>This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L034.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		Partnership (a) supports connection for the whole Valley from Bakersfield to Sacramento; (b) recommends that the economic viability of developing both the Altamont and Pacheco Pass routes be evaluated; and (c) that if it turns out that only one route is economically viable, or if one route must be implemented before the other, recommends that the Altamont corridor be the preferred route.	
W087-2	Mr. Rudolph Rosen / Ducks Unlimited / Rancho Cordova, CA	<p>As you may know, the Partnership is a unique, public-private collaboration created by Governor Schwarzenegger to improve the economic vitality and quality of life for Valley residents. The Partnership was charged with developing a Strategic Action Proposal to provide actionable strategies for sustainable economic growth that will create jobs and improve environmental quality in the region. This plan was approved by the governor in November 2006. Work is well under way.</p> <p>The Partnership held a special meeting of Valley stakeholders on August 9 on high-speed rail (HSR), obtaining comments from a large and diverse group of stakeholders. Following that meeting, the Partnership board approved its working position as follows:</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L034.
W087-3	Mr. Rudolph Rosen / Ducks Unlimited / Rancho Cordova, CA	<p>The HSR needs to serve the entire San Joaquin Valley (Bakersfield to Sacramento), and the region must stay together as it works toward implementation of this initiative. Amtrak should remain as a complementary service to HSR;</p> <p>\$15.5 million must stay in the 2007-08 budget as a minimum funding level;</p> <p>The HSR ballot measure must remain on the 2008 ballot;</p> <p>The federal government needs to contribute to the HSR project. Congress should seriously consider the establishment of a National High-Speed Rail Authority with powers similar to California's Authority;</p> <p>Passenger rail also is a priority for the Valley and is meeting immediate demand, while the HSR initiative will address mid- and long-term demand;</p> <p>Land use patterns are a critical success factor for HSR. The Blueprint Regional Planning process needs to be tightly connected to the efforts to implement HSR in the Valley;</p> <p>The route between the San Joaquin Valley and the Bay Area will have a significant impact on the Valley being served as an entire region; and</p> <p>Submit a letter to the California High-Speed Rail Authority (a) supporting connection for the whole Valley from Bakersfield to Sacramento; (b) recommending that the economic viability of developing both the Altamont and Pacheco Pass routes be evaluated; and (c) that if it turns out that only one route is economically viable, or if</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L034.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		one route must be implemented before the other, the Altamont corridor be the preferred route.	
W087-4	Mr. Rudolph Rosen / Ducks Unlimited / Rancho Cordova, CA	<p>HSR is considered by the Partnership as foundational to the future prosperity of the San Joaquin Valley. For the past 20 years, while our population has increased by 60%, our vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) increased by 150%, two-and-a-half times as much - this in a region that is now generally acknowledged to have the worst air quality in the nation, where 80% of our NOx emissions come from mobile sources. With the highest population growth rate in the state, this trend is expected to continue. California's Department of Finance expects the Valley's population to increase 104% between 2000 and 2040. Projected growth in passenger vehicle travel in the region will only exacerbate the Valley's air problem.</p> <p>Significantly, 44% of the expected HSR ridership will involve people traveling within or in and out of the Valley. Those who choose to be transported by HSR rather than passenger vehicle will be part of the solution to our traffic congestion and air quality challenges. It is important that the train serve the entire Valley for this purpose and the reason why the Altamont corridor should be pursued.</p> <p>We believe that HSR will have a positive impact on the Valley's economy. High unemployment rates have long been a challenge for the region, currently ranging anywhere from 7.3% in Madera County to 9.8% in Merced County, which has the second highest unemployment rate in the state. It is anticipated that HSR will create 450,000 permanent jobs by 2035 and 300,000 job-years of employment from construction. Additionally, core industry expansion and job creation efforts already under way could be significantly enhanced with a speedy commuter connection to northern and southern California.</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L034.
W087-5	Mr. Rudolph Rosen / Ducks Unlimited / Rancho Cordova, CA	<p>We look forward to working with you to address these comments as you construct the final draft EIR/EIS for the Central Valley-Bay Area corridor. Please feel free to contact us or the Partnership's lead executive, Ashley Swearingin, at (559) 294-6021 or ashleys@csufresno.edu.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	This comment was also received in hard copy. Please see Responses to Comment Letter L034.
W089-1	Mr. Benjamin Peeler / Attorney / benjaminpeeler@yahoo.com / CA, 92656	You need to get moving on this and start building, we are 100 years behind in this technology.	Comment acknowledged.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W090-1	Ms. Elizabeth Blois / Felton Gables Homeowners Association, Menlo Park / Menlo Park, CA	We represent Felton Gables, a residential community of 115 homes in Menlo Park, California. The first homes were built here in the 1920's and the neighborhood was developed in the 1940's. Our community has residences that are located directly bordering the Peninsula Cal-Train tracks and residences that are located on and served by Encinal Avenue, one of the Menlo Park/Atherton streets that currently have a railroad crossing. Encinal Avenue, therefore, will be considered for grade separation in many of your proposed alternatives (which we oppose as discussed below).	Comment acknowledged.
W090-2	Ms. Elizabeth Blois / Felton Gables Homeowners Association, Menlo Park / Menlo Park, CA	The people of Felton Gables strongly oppose the High Speed Train (HST) program because of the deleterious effect it will have on our quality of life and property values. The enormous expense to taxpayers has never been quantified fully or accurately. The Boston Big Dig, Bay Bridge and Chunnel experiences should be a warning to us. Furthermore, we see nothing in the program that addresses local Peninsula commute problems. This EIR has not convinced us that the enormous financial, environmental, and social costs/risks associated with this project will have any benefit to the vast majority of California taxpayers. Accordingly, we will actively work with organizations to oppose the bond issue you propose.	Comment acknowledged.
W090-3	Ms. Elizabeth Blois / Felton Gables Homeowners Association, Menlo Park / Menlo Park, CA	However, since this EIR/EIS specifically requests responses to your proposed HST alignment alternatives (Draft Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Program), we will limit further comments to this topic. Our basic position is any HST, if voters approve bond funding, should not run along established Peninsula Cal-Train railroad track lines, especially through established residential neighborhoods in Menlo Park, Atherton, and other Peninsula cities.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W090-4	Ms. Elizabeth Blois / Felton Gables Homeowners Association, Menlo Park / Menlo Park, CA	Specifically, 1. A HST rail line will seriously degrade the environment, quality of life, property values, etc. of any residential neighborhood it runs through. Felton Gables in Menlo Park is one of those neighborhoods. In your report, there is no evidence of mitigation that can prevent this. This limits options that avoid this to those running through the East Bay via the Altamont route or running the HST along Highway 101 on the Peninsula.	Alternatives through the East Bay, via the Altamont Pass, and along Highway 101 were considered but were not selected as the preferred. The Authority and FRA believe that use of the Caltrain Corridor will minimize environmental impacts while bringing direct HST service to downtown San Francisco, SFO, and the Peninsula. The Authority and FRA believe that HST on the San Francisco Peninsula will also greatly benefit Caltrain services as well as reduce traffic and improve air quality on the San Francisco Peninsula.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W090-5	Ms. Elizabeth Blois / Felton Gables Homeowners Association, Menlo Park / Menlo Park, CA	2. The HST rail line will provide minimal relief to our community in improving local commute conditions. It will not improve local train service for Menlo commuters. Also, while grade separations may speed up traffic through each rail crossing, that same traffic will be bogged down once it comes to the next traffic light, in many cases only a block away.	With HST on the Caltrain Corridor between San Francisco and San Jose, all the at-grade crossings will be eliminated. Contrary to your assertion, it will result in improved safety, reliability, and speed for all Caltrain services, thus improving local train service for Menlo Park commuters. The grade separations will also provide considerable relief to your community in terms of reduced traffic, improved air quality, and reduced noise at the crossings (there will be no horn noise or gate noise).
W090-6	Ms. Elizabeth Blois / Felton Gables Homeowners Association, Menlo Park / Menlo Park, CA	3. Construction of grade separations at Menlo Park's four grade crossings at Ravenswood, Oak Grove, Glenwood, and Encinal Avenues will effectively shut down much of Menlo Park's downtown for years. This will have devastating financial and social impacts to our city and degrade property values in our neighborhood and others.	If the HST proposal moves forward, project-level analysis will be needed to determine detailed engineering design. The Authority and FRA will work with communities to minimize the construction impacts of the HST improvements (including grade separations). The Authority and FRA believe that grade-separations can and will need to be constructed in a manner that does not create the types of impacts you have described and minimizes impacts on downtown/urban areas.
W090-7	Ms. Elizabeth Blois / Felton Gables Homeowners Association, Menlo Park / Menlo Park, CA	4. Widening of the rail corridor to accommodate two more sets of tracks will require a bermed rail bed. Thus the rail corridor will be widened to accommodate the four-track-supporting earthen berm. Also, there will be construction easements. The sum of this assures that much private property will be taken on both sides of the rail corridor. Felton Gables is a historical residential community with residences averaging over \$2,000,000. We strongly object to the inevitability of the destructive eminent domain process. Other towns undergoing this process have suffered profoundly	Comment acknowledged. Through most of the San Francisco Peninsula it is expected that the Caltrain right-of-way can accommodate four-tracks (without widening).
W090-8	Ms. Elizabeth Blois / Felton Gables Homeowners Association, Menlo Park / Menlo Park, CA	5. Elevation of the track bed 15.5 ft. over its present height will become a physical, psychological and symbolic barrier between east and west Menlo Park, a kind of Berlin Wall. We will have two Menlo Parks with a "good" side, and "wrong" side of the tracks.	More detailed design and study of potential barrier effects from the proposed HST system in the Menlo Park area is beyond the scope of this Program EIR/EIS process but would be studied in future Tier 2 project-level environmental review.



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W090-9	Ms. Elizabeth Blois / Felton Gables Homeowners Association, Menlo Park / Menlo Park, CA	6. Construction of 30 ft. towers with cables along the rail corridor for electrification will require the removal or severe pruning of many mature trees on both sides of the Menlo Park and Atherton corridor. This will reduce the noise abatement provided by these trees and will be aesthetically undesirable. Elizabeth Blois and Judy Font Co-Presidents, Felton Gables Homeowners Association	More detailed design and study of potential impacts that electrification of the Caltrain Corridor would have on mature trees in Menlo Park and Atherton areas is beyond the scope of this Program EIR/EIS process but would be studied in future Tier 2 project-level environmental review.
W091-1	Mrs. Cheryl McConaughey / Lamont Elementary School District / Superintendent / Lamont, CA	I believe that high speed rail transportation is critical to the economic improvement of communities in the San Joaquin Valley. For this reason, I fully support the forward progress of the high speed rail project.	Comment acknowledged.
W092-1	Mr. Akop Karadzhyan / Accountant / Glendale, CA	I will support 100% to the high speed rails in California. We are so many years behind Europe and other countries. We need this rail system in California. Please go forward with this plan ASAP!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Comment acknowledged.
W093-1	Richard Reineccius / actor & teacher / San Francisco, CA	Good plan, IF it is combined with adequate FREIGHT capacity to restrict big rigs.	Comment acknowledged.
W094-1	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	Dear Chairman Kopp and the members of the California High Speed Rail Authority, The Merced Group of the Sierra Club respectfully submits the following comments on the Draft Bay Area to Central Valley High Speed Train program EIR/EIS:	Comment acknowledged.
W094-2	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	The burden of the EIR/EIS document is to provide criteria for evaluating which of the alternative routings of the proposed high speed train connections between the Bay Area and the Central Valley corridor makes sense economically and environmentally. Some sections of the EIR make that determination difficult if not impossible. That shortcoming will be further discussed later.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Responses to Comment O006-3.
W094-3	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	Despite those challenges there seem to be some overriding impacts that are discernible and point to the Altamont corridor as the least disruptive to wildlife, the environment, and to human communities.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W094-4	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	CEQA clearly views the avoidance of environmental impacts which cannot be adequately mitigated as a primary consideration in making choices between alternatives. Since both the Henry Miller and Hwy 140 alignments impact the Grasslands Ecological Area (GEA) and nearby properties of sensitive habitat significance, they need close scrutiny.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 in regards to the identification of the Pacheco Pass as the Preferred Alternative.



Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W094-5	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	<p>As you are probably well aware, the GEA is a unique and valuable resource. It is critical wintering habitat for 1/2 million to 1 million migratory birds of the Pacific flyway. In spring 1/4 million birds call it home. The GEA provides habitat to 550 species of plants and animals, including 47 species that are endangered, threatened, or candidates for such classification. This kind of biodiversity lives in what is but a remnant (less than 5%) of the 4 million acres that was once Central Valley wetlands. The significance of the GEA is seen in its designation as a Wetland of International Importance, one of only 22 sites in the U.S. with such status.</p> <p>The Grasslands Ecological Area already includes a California Dept. of Parks and Recreation state park, two Fish and Wildlife national wildlife areas, a Fish and Wildlife conservation easement program and six units of California Dept. of Fish and Game wildlife areas. In addition, of late it has become a focal point for efforts to restore habitation by conservation groups.</p>	Comment acknowledged.
W094-6	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	<p>Given its existing and growing significance to wildlife systems in the Central Valley the two HSR alignments which either bisect or run adjacent to the GEA seem ill-conceived. Even the hwy 140 alignment which is less overtly invasive forms a significant barrier in the midst of a major wildlife corridor. The physical barrier of a 50-100 foot right of way, 8 foot chain link fences on both sides of the track, 25 foot electric poles, and land berms along some sections will decidedly interrupt critical wildlife corridors. The EIR lists underpasses or overpasses and "appropriate passageways" to be designed during the project level EIR to address the potential impacts to wildlife movement. The effectiveness of these solutions is questionable and needs to be specified and verified before an alignment is determined This is especially important since one (the Pacheco routing) has far greater impacts because of its proximity to wildlife populations and habitat.</p>	Please see Responses to Comment Letters O011 and L029.
W094-7	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	<p>Added impacts that the HSR would bring to local wildlife include noise (100+ db lasting 3-4 seconds, 100 + times a day), vibrations, shock waves, and collisions with animals. These impacts would all be permanent and ongoing. The disturbance to wildlife and habitat during the long period of construction further aggravate the problems of choosing the Pacheco corridor.</p>	Please see Responses to Comment L029-29.
W094-8	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	<p>The Merced Group of the Sierra Club strongly advocates the protection of Central Valley farmland, a resource of state and national, as well as regional significance. The impacts on farmland of the Pacheco alignment is nearly twice that of the Altamont option. The EIR cites a range of 755.5 to 764.2 acres for the Altamont Pas network and 1372.3 to 1378.7 for the Pacheco network alternatives. Prime farmland analysis shows the Pacheco routing again to be far more detrimental to farmland (in this case the best such land). Numbers in the EIR show the Altamont alternative</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 in regards to the identification of the Pacheco Pass as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		impacts ranging from 420.3 to 429.1 acres. The Pacheco alternative consumes approximately 1 1/2 times as much prime farmland- 663.3 to 669.7 acres. Farmland is a rare and valuable resource which we must protect and minimize impacts on	
W094-9	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	Several areas where the EIR/EIS makes it difficult to make comparisons between alternative routes are the impacts on cultural resources, proximity to parklands and wildlife refuges, and effects on endangered species. In all three of these cases data is presented for Altamont and then combined data for "the Pacheco pass and Altamont network". This seems to ignore or at least cloud the direct comparison of the alignments being considered. There is similar ambiguity in the vibration impacts related in the EIR summary.	The network alternatives are described in Chapter 2. Data are presented in Chapter 7 for each of the network alternatives. The network alternatives include Pacheco Pass alternatives, Altamont Pass alternatives, and Pacheco Pass with Altamont (local service) alternatives.
W094-10	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	"Vibration impacts are typically rated as medium, although for some network alternatives, vibration impacts are rated as medium to high." Since some distinct differences in impact are alluded to, which alternative has the higher rating- isn't that precisely the overview being evaluated. Portions of the EIR need to be rewritten and reanalyzed to make comparisons of the alternative HSR routes clear and conclusive	The Authority and FRA disagree that portions of these portions of the Program EIR/EIS need to be "rewritten and reanalyzed." Please see Standard Responses 1 and 2.
W094-11	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	Part of the discussion of high speed train rail lines in the state should include the vision of what this system will look like decades down the road upon its completion. Since the Sacramento region is a key component in the long term design, an important consideration for this "first phase" should be which alternative will facilitate future expansion. There cannot be any question that the Altamont alignment connecting with the Central Valley far north of the Pacheco plan will make future connection to Sacramento easier and less expensive.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 in regards to the identification of the Pacheco Pass as the Preferred Alternative.
W094-12	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	In conclusion, based on the data in the draft EIR/EIS, the Altamont corridor seems a clear preference. It is the least invasive to wildlife and habitat, it best protects existing farmland, it makes use of an already highly disturbed transportation corridor. In addition, it offers the most complete "first stage" in a system designed to eventually include the Sacramento portion of the Valley.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 in regards to the identification of the Pacheco Pass as the Preferred Alternative.
W094-13	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	It is our hope that the High Speed Rail Authority will consider all potential impacts of the rail corridors under consideration and follow the CEQA guidelines which give preference to existing high volume corridors over those with lower volume and populations.	Comment acknowledged.
W094-14	Mr. Roderick Webster / Merced Sierra Club / Chair / Merced, CA	Please keep us apprised of future developments in this process, including opportunities to access the project level EIR as it is made available. We are highly supportive of high speed rail and its potential to create a viable public transportation alternative that will improve air quality. Wise choices will be needed to make high	Comment acknowledged. You will be sent an electronic copy of the Final Program EIR/EIS once it is available.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		<p>speed rail, its costs and impacts, palatable to the electorate. Thank you the efforts of the Authority and staff to make this ambitious project a reality.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Roderick Webster, chair, Merced Group Sierra Club / Tehipite Chapter</p>	
W095-1	Mr. Laurent Garnett / SFUSD / Teacher / San Francisco, CA	I'm all for it!	Comment acknowledged.
W096-1	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	<p>I posted online on 11/25/2007. I would like to add these additional comments:</p> <p>The CHSRA has made this comment on one of the posted Program EIR/EIS online documents, "The station locations shown here are spaced approximately 50 mi (80 km) apart in rural areas and 15 mi (24 km) apart in the metropolitan areas. Additional or more closely spaced stations would negatively affect travel times and the ability to operate both express and local services."</p> <p>I agree with this statement, however I'd like the CHSRA to consider alternatives. Station locations could be spaced more closely together in metropolitan areas, but any given train would not have to stop at each station. For example, a train could stop at station 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and the next train could make stops at station 2, 4, 6, 8, 10. This would allow local service to many more cities while maintaining express travel times that we would all like.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. The HST proposal includes the assumption (as described in Chapter 2) that there would be a variety of HST services (express, skip-stop, local, regional). The Authority and FRA believe that the station spacing quote from the Program EIR/EIS included in your comment is accurate and based on worldwide HST experiences. Additional HST stations will not be considered in this Program EIR/EIS.</p>
W096-2	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	Looking over the prospective routes into the Bay Area to Central Valley, I'm having second thoughts on my recommendation of the Pacheco Pass alignment.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W096-3	Richard McCarthy / Santa Ana, CA	<p>As I had mentioned previously, I feel strongly about the Bay Area having a complete loop around it for HST service (with a Transbay Tube linking SF to Oakland). With such a loop in place, service from the Central Valley would be better served with a path along the Altamont Pass. Whatever the exact path this would take can be determined by the local residents in conjunction with the CHSRA, but there should only be a single path in and out of the bay area, so there isn't any confusion about station locations. With the added high speed service along the SF Peninsula south to Diridon, Caltrain could possibly free up some trains (for express service) to Morgan Hill and Gilroy, which are already being served by Caltrain. This would eliminate the need to route the HST through the Henry W Coe State Park. At the same time, this alignment would more tend to link Northern California with Southern California directly, with service up to, and perhaps beyond Sacramento. Thank you.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W097-1	Mr. Robert Schneider / Avionics manager/technician / Windsor, CA	<p>Looking ahead, say 30 years. Cars will likely be electric. Air travel will become increasingly expensive, oil based fuels will be limited, and air quality and green house gasses well, you see where this is going. I suggest that any plan take all of these things into account.</p> <p>Please consider a plan that will not become obsolete in 30 years. It is possible now to build an all electric system. Since much of the alignment passes through the central valley, it is an ideal location for advanced solar power. Given a length of some 200 miles, it would be possible to have a minimum 75MW and as much as 200 MW generated through solar power. Far more than needed to operate a high speed passenger rail line. Of course, the excess power could be sold to regional providers-PG&E, CON ED, SDG&E... The rail cars could be self powered, and utilize magnetic coupling to achieve maximum flexibility for demand. Please, think "futuristically" for things change fast these days, and anything ten years old now, will be outdated ten years from now.</p>	<p>The Authority's proposed HST system will not become "obsolete in 30 years." To the best extent possible, the Authority has attempted to take into consideration how California will be in 2030 and beyond. The HST system uses electric power. The Authority is investigating the feasibility of using only renewable sources of energy.</p>
W098-1	Mr. Arthur Keller / Palo Alto, CA	<p>The Pacheco Pass Route is the preferred alternative. First, there already is mass transit service over the Altamont Pass, while there is no mass transit service over the Pacheco Pass. Second, building high speed rail over the Pacheco Pass will give alternatives to widening the road that currently goes through it. Third, building high speed rail along the Caltrain right of way is compatible with the improvements scheduled and funded for Caltrain.</p> <p>Fourth, the Pacheco Pass route should be combined with stop at Palo Alto. This station is currently the second busiest on the Caltrain line, second only to the San Francisco terminus and greater than any stop in San Jose. Furthermore, this station is adjacent to the second most dense business district in the Bay Area, second to downtown San Francisco. And there is funding in the VTA sales tax measure to build a multimodal train station at Palo Alto on Caltrain, and such a station would be suitable for high speed rail.</p> <p>Finally, high speed rail from the Pacheco Pass to San Jose and then continuing to San Francisco and to Oakland could provide an effective alternative to connect San Jose by rail to the east bay, compared with the proposed BART expansion.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.</p>
W099-1	Ms. Sabrina Merlo / Bay Area Bicycle Coalition / Oakland, CA	<p>We would like the Authority to investigate the feasibility of building a bicycle/walking path along the train route.</p>	<p>This can be considered at the project-level of design. There may be some locations (particularly in urban areas where speeds are reduced) where such facilities may be feasible and practicable.</p>

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W100-1	Stanley Kao / Daly City, CA	What about a station at SJ airport? And also instead of a station at union city, have it at the new Fremont baseball stadium.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. A station at San Jose Airport (Santa Clara) was considered but rejected.
W101-1	Mr. Kevin Standlee / Computer Programmer / Fremont, CA	<p>I urge the Authority to select the Altamont-Dumbarton alignment as the most sensible choice for the entire Bay Area. My apartment complex adjoins the existing rail line in Fremont/Centerville. I live within easy walking distance of Centerville Station. Unlike it seems many of my neighbors, I welcome a modern transportation system in my area. I have traveled in Europe and Japan and see what a boon a well-designed, well-placed system is to a country.</p> <p>Please do not knuckle under to parochial concerns. The Altamont alignment is the most sensible choice and makes far more sense for people traveling from the Central Valley to points in the Bay Area. If it is really so vital that San Jose be served by every single train, then adopt split/join operation such as used in Europe and Japan, with trains joining/splitting at Redwood Junction.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W102-1	Mr. Douglas Sibley / retired / Martinez, CA	1. I agree with MTC's recent decision to support both the Altamont Pass (my first choice) and the Pacheco Pass routes.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative. The Authority also has committed to work with the region to implement improvements in the Altamont Corridor (as a separate but related project). The Authority believes that its Preferred Alternative together with its commitment in the Altamont Corridor are consistent with MTC's recommendations and the Bay Area Regional Rail Plan.
W102-2	Mr. Douglas Sibley / retired / Martinez, CA	2. I disagree with the proposed Oakland Station underneath BART's 12th Street station. With the depth required in unstable Bay silt, the proximity of so many tall buildings, the lack of any additional (let alone convenient) parking for drop off, overnight, or longer stays, the cost of tunneling there from both the north and south of 12th Street BART makes even the thought of such a proposal as only proposed to kill even the concept of a downtown station. What I see as a much more viable alternative is to locate an Oakland station underground just two blocks or so south of the West Oakland BART Station focused on a site on 7th Street owned by Caltrans	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 for the rationale for identifying the Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
		but leased to the US Postal Service. (Perhaps BART might be interested in undergrounding its tracks between its Oakland wye and their transbay tube.) An East Bay HSR maintenance facility could be equitably located in the Richmond area. There should also be considered a joint Amtrak/BART/High Speed Rail station at the newly remodeled downtown Richmond Transit Center. I believe the overall cost of locating end-of-the-line facilities in Richmond or to the north with a station along 7th Street in Oakland, connecting to BART there and/or a station in the Richmond area would offset the cost of tunneling so deep under downtown Oakland and trying to adapt a jerry-rigged user-friendly station there.	
W102-3	Mr. Douglas Sibley / retired / Martinez, CA	3. I ask that these suggestions be included as "recommended" in the Final EIR/EIS.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W103-1	Douglas Frazier / Kensington, CA	These comments about the 2007 Bay Area Draft EIR/EIS are related to comments contained the document titled SAN FRANCISCO GRAND CENTRAL (SFGC), A Comment about the Draft EIR/EIS for the Proposed California High Speed Rail Project, submitted August 30, 2004 and revised September 14, 2004. Among the 2004 SFGC comments are the following:	Comment acknowledged.
W103-2	Douglas Frazier / Kensington, CA	A spectacular opportunity to create a world famous passenger train experience is not being considered. The 2004 DEIR/EIS and the 2007 Bay Area Draft EIR/EIS do not consider any alternatives to the location of the San Francisco HSR terminal station or the route of the HSR into San Francisco.	This statement is incorrect. Please refer to the Summary, Chapter 2, Chapter 7, and Chapter 8 of the Final Program EIR/EIS. The Authority and FRA considered terminus locations at Oakland, San Francisco, San Jose, and Union City.
W103-3	Douglas Frazier / Kensington, CA	The use of a combined Caltrain/HSR alignment via the Peninsula is operationally redundant and not in the best interest of Caltrain or the HSR. The HSR cannot attain true high speed in that corridor. Train congestion under Transbay Terminal is inevitable with combined use.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W103-4	Douglas Frazier / Kensington, CA	The Caltrain route should be further improved and extended into downtown San Francisco as an exclusive commuter train system with passing tracks. The entire proposed train platform area below the Transbay Terminal should be dedicated for Caltrain use and Caltrain future expansion.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name / Organization / Occupation / City, State	Comment	Response
W103-5	Douglas Frazier / Kensington, CA	<p>The CAHSR system should be a true, completely separate HSR system, avoiding any system interoperability issues for, safer, more economical, more reliable and faster service.</p> <p>An HSR crossing of the Bay on a bridge between Oakland and San Francisco offers opportunities to carry BART or light rail commuter service to Treasure Island with parallel tracks. It also includes pedestrian and bicycle access continuing via the west span of the Bay Bridge into downtown San Francisco.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W103-6	Douglas Frazier / Kensington, CA	<p>The following comments supplement the 2004 SFGC comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HSR should enter the Bay Area through the Altamont pass and split at one of the proposed Niles area locations. • No HSR construction should take place west of the East Bay. Caltrain is capable of providing the same speed of service into downtown San Francisco and San Jose where transfers can be made to the HSR system. • Caltrain should take full and exclusive responsibility for the Dumbarton crossing. It should meet the HSR at the Niles split station. • On the East Bay, BART should be improved with upgraded stations and passing tracks from Richmond to San Jose. There should be BART/HSR interconnection at only downtown Oakland, Oakland Airport, Niles split, and downtown San Jose. <p>The funding saved by not building a redundant, parallel, high speed train system on the Peninsula can be devoted to taking advantage of the opportunity to bring the HSR into downtown San Francisco on a bridge.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.
W104-1	Stuart Salazar / Sacramento, CA	I believe it is very important that you build the Altamont pass route first. And that you build a line to Sacramento before you build a second line to the bay area. You are excluding apprx 2.5 million riders from the system while building two lines to the bay area that is inexcusable and leaving Sacramento with just a gesture of hope that we may one day be connected to this system is just plain arrogant.	Comment acknowledged. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the identification of Pacheco Pass (San Francisco and San Jose via the Peninsula) as the Preferred Alternative.

